# ADDITIONAL DISCOURSES OF Mr. Chillingworth NEVER BEFORE PRINTED.

## Imprimatur.

*Ex Ædib. Lambeth. Jun.* 14. 1686.

GUIL. NEEDHAM RR. in Christo P. ac D. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacr. Domesticis.

*LONDON*,

Printed for *Richard Chiswell* at the *Rose* and *Crown* in *S. Pauls* Church-Yard, 1687.

# CONTENTS.

I. A *Conference betwixt Mr.* Chillingworth *and Mr.* Lewgar, *whether the* Roman Church *be the* Catholick-Church, *and all out of her Communion Hereticks or Schiſmaticks.* p. 1.

II. *A Diſcourſe againſt the Infallibility of the* Roman Church, *with an Anſwer to all thoſe Texts of Scripture that are alledged to prove it.* p. 26.

III. *A Conference concerning the Infallibility of the* Roman Church; *proving that the preſent Church of* Rome *either errs in her worſhiping the Bleſſed Virgin; or that the Ancient Church did err in condemning the* Collyridians *as Hereticks.* p. 41.

IV. *An Argument drawn from Communicating of Infants, as without which they could not be ſaved againſt the Churches Infallibility.* p. 68.

V. *An Argument againſt Infallibility, drawn from the Doctrin of the* Millenaries. p. 80.

VI. *A Letter relating to the ſame ſubject.* p. 89.

VII.

VII. *An Argument against the* Roman *Churches Infallibility, taken from the Contradictions in their Doctrin of Transubstantiation.* p. 91.

VIII. *An account of what moved the Author to turn a Papist, with his Confutation of the Arguments that perswaded him thereto.* p. 94.

IX. *A Discourse concerning Tradition.* p. 103.

---

The Reader is desired to take notice of a great mistake of the Printer and to Correct it, That he has made this the running Title over most of the Additional Pieces, *viz. A Conference betwixt* Mr. *Chillingworth and* Mr. *Lewgar*; which should only have been set over the first: there are also some literal mistakes, as pag. 65. ἱεϛουργεῖν twice for ἱερουργεῖν, and such like, not to be imputed to the Author.

---

A CON-

# A CONFERENCE BETWIXT Mr. CHILLINGWORTH AND Mr. LEWGAR.

*Theſis.* THE Church of *Rome* (taken diffuſively for all Chriſtians communicating with the Biſhop of *Rome*) was the Judge of Controverſies at that time, when the Church of *England* made an alteration in her Tenents.

*Argu.* She was the Judge of Controverſies at that time, which had an Authority of deciding them. But the Church of *Rome* at that time had the Authority of deciding them. *Ergo.*

*Anſw.* A limited Authority to decide Controverſies according to the Rule of Scripture and Univerſal Tradition, and to oblige her own Members (ſo long as ſhe evidently contradicted not that Rule) to obedience I grant ſhe had: but an unlimited, an infallible Authority, or ſuch as could not but proceed according to that Rule, and ſuch as ſhould bind all the Churches in the World to Obedience (as the *Greek* Church) I ſay ſhe had not.

*Queſt.* When your Church hath decided a Controverſie, I deſire to know whether any particular Church or perſon hath Authority to reexamine her deciſion, whether

ſhe hath obſerved her Rule or no; and free himſelf from the obedience of it, by his or her particular judgment?

*Anſw.* If you underſtand by your Church, the Church Catholick, probably I ſhould anſwer no: but if you underſtand by your Church, that only which is in Subordination to the See of *Rome*, or if you underſtand a Council of this Church, I anſwer, yea.

*Arg.* That was the Catholick Church, which did abide in the Root of Apoſtolick Unity: But the Church of *Rome* at that time was the only Church that did abide in the Root of Apoſtolick Unity. *Ergo.*

*Queſt.* What mean you by Apoſtolick Unity?

*Anſw.* I mean the Unity of that Fellowſhip wherein the Apoſtles Lived and Died.

*Queſt.* Wherein was this Unity?

*Anſw.* Herein it conſiſted, that they all profeſſed one Faith, obeyed one Supream Tribunal, and communicated together in the ſame Prayers and Sacraments.

*Solut.* Then the Church of *Rome* continued not in this Apoſtolick Unity; for it continued not in the ſame Faith, wherein the Apoſtles Lived and Died: for though it retained ſo much (in my judgment) as was eſſential to the being of a Church, yet it degenerated from the Church of the Apoſtles times, in many things which were very profitable; as in Latin Service, and Communion in one kind.

*Argu.* Some Church did continue in the ſame Faith wherein the Apoſtles lived and died: But there was no Church at that time which did continue in the Apoſtles Faith beſides the *Roman* Church. *Ergo.*

*Anſw.* That ſome Church did continue in the Apoſtles Faith in all things neceſſary, I grant it: that any did continue in the Integrity of it, and in a perfect conformity with it in all things expedient and profitable, I deny it.

*Queſt.* Is it not neceſſary to a Churches continuing in the Apoſtles Faith, that ſhe continue in a perfect conformity with it in all things expedient and profitable?

*Anſw.* A perfect conformity in all things is neceſſary to a perfect continuance in the Apoſtles Faith: but to

an

an imperfect continuance, an imperfect conformity is ſufficient; and ſuch I grant the *Roman* Church had.

*Queſt.* Is not a perfect continuance in the Apoſtles Faith neceſſary to a Churches continuance in Apoſtolick Unity?

*Aſw.* It is neceſſary to a perfect continuance in Apoſtolick Unity.

*Argu.* There was ſome one company of Chriſtians at the time of *Luthers* riſing, which was the *Catholick Church*; But there was no other company at that time beſides the *Roman*: *Ergo*, the *Roman* at that time was the *Catholick Church*.

*Anſw.* There was no one company of Chriſtians, which in oppoſition to and Excluſion of all other companies of Chriſtians was the Catholick Church.

*Argu.* If the *Catholick Church* be ſome one company of Chriſtians in oppoſition to and excluſion of all other companies, then if there was ſome one company, ſhe was one in oppoſition to and excluſion of all other companies: But the *Catholick Church* is one company of Chriſtians in oppoſition to and excluſion of, *&c. Ergo*, There was then ſome one company which was the *Catholick Church* in oppoſition to and excluſion of all other companies.

The *Minor* proved by the Teſtimonies of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, teſtifying that they underſtood the Church to be *one* in the ſenſe alledged.

1. If this Unity which cannot be ſeparated at all or divided, is alſo among Hereticks, what contend we farther? Why call we them Hereticks, S. *Cypr. Epiſt.* 75.

2. But if there be but one Flock, how can he be accounted of the Flock, which is not within the number of it? *Id*: *Ibid.*

3. When *Parmenian* commends one Church, he condemns all the reſt; for beſides one, which is the true *Catholick*, other Churches are eſteemed to be among Hereticks, but are not. S. *Optat. lib.* 1.

4. The Church therefore is but one, this cannot be among all Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. *Ibid.*

5. You ſay you offer for the Church, which is one; this very thing is part of a lie to call it one, which you have divided into two: *Id: Ibid.*

6. The Church is *one*, which cannot be amongſt us and amongſt you; it remains then, that it be in one only place. *Id: Ibid.*

7. Although there be many Hereſies of Chriſtians, and that all would be called *Catholicks*, yet there is always one Church, *&c.* S. *Auguſt. de util. credend. c.* 7.

8. The queſtion between us is, where the Church is, whether with us or with them, for ſhe is but *one. Id: de unitat. c.* 2.

9. The proofs of the *Catholick* prevailed, whereby they evicted the Body of Chriſt to be with them, and by conſequence not to be with the *Donatiſts*; for it is manifeſt that ſhe is *one* alone. *Id. Collat. Carthag. lib.* 3.

10. In illud cantic. 6. 7. *There are* 60 *Queens and* 80 *Concubines and Damoſels without number, but my Dove is one*, &c. He ſaid not, *my* Queens are 60, and *my Concubines*, &c. but he ſaid my Dove is but one; becauſe all the Sects of Philoſophers and Hereſies of Chriſtians are none of his; his is but one, to wit, the *Catholick* Church, *&c.* S. *Epiphan. in fine Panar.*

11. A man may not call the Conventicles of Hereticks (I mean *Marcionites*, *Manichees*, and the reſt) Churches; therefore the Tradition appoints you to ſay, *I believe one Holy Catholick Church*, &c. S. *Cyrill. Catech.* 18.

And theſe Teſtimonies I think are ſufficient to ſhew the judgment of the Ancient Church, that this Title of the Church *one*, is directly and properly excluſive to all companies beſides one; to wit, that where there are diverſe profeſſions of Faith, or diverſe Communions, there is but one of theſe, which can be the *Catholick Church*. Upon this ground I deſire ſome company of Chriſtians to be named, profeſſing a diverſe Faith, and holding a diverſe Communion from the *Roman*, which was the *Catholick Church* at the time of *Luthers* riſing: and if no other in this ſenſe can be named, than was ſhe the *Catholick Church* at that time, and therefore her judgment to be reſted in, and

and her Communion to be embraced upon peril of Schiſm and Hereſie.

Mr. *Chillingworths* Anſwer.

Upon the ſame ground, if you pleaſed, you might deſire a Proteſtant to name ſome Company of Chriſtians, profeſſing a diverſe Faith, and holding a diverſe Communion from the *Greek* Church, which was the Catholick Church at the time of *Luthers* riſing; and ſeeing he could name no other in this ſenſe. concludes that the *Greek* Church was the Catholick Church at that time. Upon the very ſame ground you might have concluded for the Church of the *Abyſſines*, or *Armenians*, or any other ſociety of Chriſtians extant before *Luthers* time. And ſeeing this is ſo, thus I argue againſt your ground.

1. That ground which concludes indifferently for both parts of a contradiction, muſt needs be falſe and deceitful, and conclude for neither part: But this ground concludes indifferently both parts of a contradiction; *viz.* That the *Greek* Church is the Catholick Church, and not the *Roman*, as well as, That the *Roman* is the Catholick Church, and not the *Greek*: Therefore the ground is falſe and deceitful, ſeem it never ſo plauſible.

2. I anſwer Secondly, that you ſhould have taken notice of my Anſwer, which I then gave you; which was, that your *major*, as you then framed your Argument, but as now, your *minor* is not always true, if by *one* you underſtand *one* in external Communion; ſeeing nothing hindred in my Judgment, but that one Church excommunicated by another upon an inſufficient cauſe, might yet remain a true member of the Catholick Church; and that Church, which upon the overvaluing this cauſe doth excommunicate the other, though in fault, may yet remain a member of the Catholick Church: which is evident from the difference about *Eaſter-day* between the Church of *Rome* and the Churches of *Aſia*; for which vain matter *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome* excommunicated the Churches of *Aſia*. And yet I believe you will not ſay, that either the Church excommunicating, or the Church excommunicated, ceaſed

ſed to be a true member of the Church Catholick. The caſe is the ſame between the *Greek* and the *Roman* Church; for though the difference between them be greater, yet it is not ſo great, as to be a ſufficient ground of excommunication: and therefore the excommunication was cauſeleſs, and conſequently *Brutum fulmen*, and not ratified or confirmed by God in Heaven; and therefore the Church of *Greece* at *Luthers* riſing might be, and was a true member of the Catholick Church.

As concerning the places of Fathers, which you alledge; I demand, 1. If I can produce you an equal, or greater number of Fathers, or more ancient than theſe, not contradicted by any that lived with them or before them, for ſome doctrin condemned by the *Roman* Church, whether you will ſubſcribe it? If not, with what face or conſcience can you make uſe of, aud build your whole Faith upon the Authority of Fathers in ſome things, and reject the ſame authority in others?

2. Secondly, becauſe you urge S. *Cyprians* Authority, I deſire you to tell me, whether this Argument in his time would have concluded a neceſſity of reſting in the Judgement of the *Roman* Church, or no? If not, how ſhould it come to paſs, that it ſhould ſerve now, and not then, fit this time and not that? as if it were like an Almanack, that would not ſerve for all Meridians? If it would, why was it not urged by others upon S. *Cyprian*, or repreſented by S. *Cyprian* to himſelf for his direction, when he differed from the *Roman* Church, and all other that herein conformed unto her, touching the point of Re-baptizing Hereticks; which the *Roman* Church held unlawful and damnable, S. *Cyprian* not only lawful, but neceſſary; ſo well did he reſt in the Judgment of that Church: *Quid verba audiam, cùm facta videam*, ſays he in the Comedy? And Cardinal *Perron* tells you in his Epiſtle to *Caſaubon*, that nothing is more unreaſonable, than to draw conſequences from the words of Fathers, againſt their lively and actual practice.

The ſame may be ſaid in refutation of the places out of S. *Auſtin*; who was ſo far from concluding, from them or any

any other, a neceſſity of reſting in the Judgment of the *Roman* Church, that he himſelf, as your Authors teſtifie, lived and died in oppoſition of it; even in that main fundamental point, upon which Mr. *Lewgar* hath built the neceſſity of his departure from the Church of *England*, and embracing the Communion of the *Roman* Church, that is, The Supream Authority of that Church over other Churches, and the power of receiving Appeals from them. Mr. *Lewgar*, I know, cannot be ignorant of theſe things; and therefore I wonder, with what conſcience he can produce their words againſt us, whoſe Actions are for us.

If it be ſaid, that S. *Cyprian* and S. *Auſtin* were Schiſmaticks for doing ſo; it ſeems then Schiſmaticks may not only be members of the Church, againſt Mr. *Lewgars* main concluſion, but Canoniz'd Saints of it; or elſe S. *Auſtin* and S. *Cyprian* ſhould be raſed out of the *Roman* Kalendar.

If it be ſaid, that the point of Re-baptization was not defined in S. *Cyprians* time; I ſay that in the Judgment of the Biſhop and Church of *Rome* and their adherents, it was: For they urged it as an Original and Apoſtolick Tradition, and conſequently at leaſt of as great force as any Church definition. They excommunicated *Firmilianus* and condemned S. *Cyprian*, as a falſe Chriſt, and a falſe Apoſtle, for holding the contrary; and urged him *Tyrannico terrore* to conform his judgment to theirs, as he himſelf clearly intimates.

If it be ſaid, they differed only from the particular Church of *Rome*, and not from the *Roman* Church, taking it for the univerſal ſociety of Chriſtians in Communion with that Church: I Anſwer,

1. They know no ſuch ſenſe of the word, I am ſure never uſed it in any ſuch; which whether it had been poſſible, if the Church of *Rome* had been in their judgment to other Churches in ſpiritual matters, as the City was to other Cities and Countries in temporals, I leave it to indifferent men to judge.

2. Secondly,

2. Secondly, that they differed not only from the particular *Roman* Church, but also from all other Churches, that agreed with it in those doctrins.

3. Thirdly, I desire you would answer me directly, whether the *Roman* Church, taking it for that particular Church, be of necessity to be held Infallible in Faith by every *Roman* Catholick, or not. To this Question I instantly desire a direct answer without tergiversation, that we may at length get out of the cloud, and you may say, *Coram, quem quæritis, adsum.* If you say, they are not bound to believe so; then it is no Article of Faith, nor no certain truth upon which men may safely rest without fluctuation or fear of error: And if so; I demand

1. Why are all your Clergy bound to swear, and consequently your Laity (if they have Communion of Faith with them) by your own grounds, bound to believe, That the *Roman* Church is the Mistris of all other Churches? where it is evident from the relation and opposition of the *Roman* to other Churches, that the *Roman* Church is there taken for that particular Church.

2. Secondly, why then do you so often urge that mistaken saying of *Iræneus, Ad hanc Ecclesiam necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam?* falsely translating it, as Cardinal *Perron* in *French*, and my *L. F.* in *English*——*All Churches must agree with this Church*; for *convenire ad* signifies not to *agree with*, but to *come unto*; whereas it is evident for the aforesaid reason, that the *Roman* is here taken for that particular Church.

3. Thirdly, if that particular Church be not certainly infallible, but subject to error in points of faith; I would know, if any division of your Church should happen, in which the Church of *Rome* either alone, or with some others should take one way; the Churches of *Spain* and *France*, and many other Churches another, what direction should an ignorant Catholick have then from the prerended Guide of Faith? How shall he know which of these Companies is the Church? seeing all other Churches distinguished from the *Roman* may err, and seeing the *Roman* Church is now supposed subject to error, and consequently

ly not certain to guard thoſe men, or thoſe Churches that adhere unto it from erring.

4. Fourthly, if that particular Church be not infallible in Faith, let us then ſuppoſe that *de facto* it does err in faith; ſhall we not then have an Heretical head upon a Catholick body? A head of the Church, which were no member of the Church? which ſure were a very ſtrange and heterogeneous Monſter! If to avoid theſe inconveniences you will ſay, that *Roman* Catholicks muſt of neceſſity hold that particular Church infallible in faith; I ſuppoſe it will evidently follow, that S. *Auſtin* and S. *Cyprian* (notwithſtanding thoſe ſentences you pretend out of them) were no *Roman* Catholicks; ſeeing they lived and died in the contrary belief and profeſſion. Let me ſee theſe abſurdities fairly and clearly avoided, and I will diſpute no more, but follow you whitherſoever you ſhall lead me.

3. Thirdly, I anſwer, that the places alledged are utterly impertinent to the concluſion you ſhould have proved; which was, That it was impoſſible, that two Societies of Chriſtians divided upon what cauſe ſoever in external Communion, may be in truth and in Gods account, both of them parts of the Catholick Church: whereas your teſtimonies, if we grant them all, ſay no more but this; That the Societies of Hereticks, which are ſuch as overthrow any doctrin neceſſary to ſalvation; and of Schiſmaticks, which are ſuch as ſeparate from the Churches Communion without any pretence of error in the Church or unlawfulneſs in the conditions of her Communion; I ſay, they prove only this, that ſuch Societies as theſe, are no parts of the Church: which I willingly grant of all ſuch, as are properly and formally Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; from which number I think (with S. *Auſtin*) they are to be exempted, *Qui quærunt cautâ ſollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati, cùm invenerint.* Whereas I put the caſe of ſuch two Societies, which not differing indeed in any thing neceſſary to ſalvation, do yet erroneouſly believe that the errors wherewith they charge one another, are damnable, and ſo by this opinion of mutual error, are kept on both ſides from being Hereticks.

Becauſe I deſire to bring you and others to the truth, or to be brought to it by you, I thought good for your direction in your intended Reply, to acquaint you with theſe things:

1. That I conceive the ——— in your diſcourſe is this. That whenſoever any two Societies of Chriſtians differ in external Communion, one of them muſt be of neceſſity Heretical or Schiſmatical. I conceive there is no ſuch neceſſity; and that the ſtories of *Victor* and the Biſhops of *Aſia*, S. *Cyprian* and Pope *Stephen* make it evident; and therefore I deſire you to produce ſome convincing argument to the contrary; and that you may the better do it, I thought good to inform you what I mean by an *Heretick*, and what by a *Schiſmatick*.

An *Heretick* therefore I conceive him, that holds an Error againſt Faith with obſtinacy. Obſtinate I conceive him, who will not change his Opinion, when his reaſons for it are ſo anſwered, that he cannot reply; and when the reaſons againſt it are ſo convincing, that he cannot anſwer them. By the Faith I underſtand all thoſe Doctrines and no more, which Chriſt taught his Apoſtles, and the Apoſtles the Church; yet I exclude not from this number the certain and evident deductions of them.

A *Schiſmatick* I account him, (and *Facundus Hermianenſis* hath taught me to do ſo) who, without any ſuppoſing of error in the conditions of a Churches Communion, divides himſelf either from the obedience of that Church to which he owes obedience; or from the Communion of that Church to which he owes Communion.

2. Another thing, which I thought fit to acquaint you with, is this: That you go upon another very falſe and deceitful ſuppoſition; *viz.* that if we will not be *Proteſtants*, preſently we muſt be *Papiſts*; if we forſake the Church of *England*, we muſt go preſently to the Church of *Rome*: Whereas if your Arguments did conclude (as they do not) that before *Luthers* time, there was ſome Church of one Denomination, which was the Catholick Church; I ſhould much rather think it were the Church of *Greece*, than the Church of *Rome*; and I believe others alſo would think

think ſo as well as I, but for that reaſon which one gives, why more men hold the Pope above a Council, than a Council above a Pope, that is, becauſe Councils give no maintenance or preferment, and the Popes do.

Think not yet, I pray, that I ſay this, as if I conceived this to be your reaſon for preferring the *Roman* Church before the *Greek*; (for I proteſt I do not) but rather, that conceiving verily you were to leave the Church of *England*, to avoid trouble you took the next Boat, and went to the Church of *Rome*, becauſe that beſpake you firſt.

You impute to me (as I hear) that the way I take is deſtructive only, and that I build nothing; which firſt, is not a fault; for Chriſtian Religion is not now to be built; but only I deſire to have the rubbiſh and impertinent Lumber taken off, which you have laid upon it, which hides the glorious ſimplicity of it from them which otherwiſe would embrace it. Remember, I pray, *Averroes* his ſaying; *Quandoquidem Chriſtiani adorant quod comedunt, ſit anima mea cum Philoſophis*; and conſider the ſwarms of Atheiſts in *Italy*, and then tell me, whether your unreaſonable and contradictious Doctrines, your forged Miracles and counterfeit Legends have not in all probability produced this effect. Secondly, if it be a fault, it is certainly your own; for your diſcourſe intended for the proof of a poſitive concluſion —— *That we muſt be Papiſts* —— proves *in deed and in truth* nothing; but even *in ſhew and appearance* no more but this Negative, that we muſt not be Proteſtants; but what we muſt be, if we muſt not be Proteſtants, God knows; you in this Diſcourſe (I am ſure) do not ſhew it.

Mr. *Lewgars* Reply.

§. 1. The minor of Mr. *Chillingworths* Argument againſt my ground is very weak, being framed upon a falſe ſuppoſition, that a Proteſtant could name no other Church profeſſing a diverſe Faith, &c. from the *Greek* Church, which was the Catholick Church: for if he could not indeed name any other, the title would remain to the *Greek* Church: But he hath the *Roman* to name, and ſo my ground cannot conclude, either for the *Greek* or *Abyſſine* or

any other, beſides the *Roman*, but for that it does, except he can name ſome other.

§. 2. His ſecond anſwer is weak likewiſe; for my Minor is always true; at leaſt they thought it to be ſo, whoſe Authorities I produce in confirmation of it, as will appear to any one that conſiders them well; how their force lies in *Theſi*, not in *Hypotheſi*; not that the Church was not then divided into more Societies than one, but that ſhe could never be.

§. 3. As for his Inſtance to the contrary, wherein he believes I will not ſay the Churches excommunicated by *Victor* ceaſed to be a true member of the Catholick: If I ſay ſo, I ſay no more than the Ancient Fathers ſaid before me. *Iræneus* when he deſired *Victor* μὴ ἀποκόπτειν, not to cut off ſo many and great Churches; and *Ruffinus*, *reprehendit eam, quod non benè feciſſet abſcindere ab unitate corporis*, &c.

§. 4. But howſoever the caſe of Excommunication may be, the diviſion of external Communion which I intended, and the Fathers ſpake of in the alledged Authorities, was that which was made by voluntary ſeparation.

§. 5. Whereby the Church (before one Society) is divided into ſeveral diſtinct Societies, both claiming to be the Church; of which Societies ſo divided, but one can be the Catholick; and this is proved by the Authorities alledged; which Authorities muſt not be anſwered by diſproving them, as he does (for that is to change his Adverſary, and confute the Fathers ſayings, inſtead of mine) but by ſhewing their true ſenſe or judgment to be otherwiſe than I alledged it.

§. 6. To his demand upon the places alledged I Anſwer, that I do not build my whole faith of this concluſion upon the Authority of thoſe Fathers; for I produce them, not for the Authority of the thing, but of the Expoſition. The thing it ſelf is an Article of the Creed, *Unam Catholicam*; grounded in expreſs Scripture, *Columba mea unica*: but becauſe there is difference in underſtanding this Propheſie, I produce theſe Authorities, to ſhew the Judgment of the Ancient Church how they underſtood it; and the proper anſwer to this is either to ſhew, that theſe words were

were not there, or at leaſt, not this meaning; and ſo to ſhew their meaning out of other places more pregnant.

§. 7. And I promiſe, that whenſoever an equal conſent of Fathers can be ſhewed for any thing, as I can ſhew for this, I will believe it as firmly as I do this.

§. 8. But this is not the Anſwerers part, to propound doubts and difficulties, but to ſatisfie the proof objected.

§. 9. And if this courſe be any more taken, I will ſave my ſelf all farther labour in a buſineſs ſo likely to be endleſs.

§. 10. His ſecond Anſwer to the places is wholly impertinent; for therein would he diſprove them from watching a neceſſity of reſting in the judgment of the *Roman Church*; whereas I produced them only to ſhew, that among ſeveral Societies of Chriſtians, only *one* can be the *Catholick*; and againſt this his ſecond Anſwer ſaith nothing.

§. 11. In his third Anſwer he makes ſome ſhew of reply to the Authorities themſelves; but he commits a double Error: One, that he impoſes upon me a wrong concluſion to be proved, as will appear by comparing my concluſion in my Paper, with the concluſion he would appoint me.

§. 12. Another, that he impoſes upon the Authorities a wrong Interpretation, no way grounded in the words themſelves, nor in the places whence they were taken, nor in any other places of the ſame Fathers, but meerly forged out of his own Brain. For firſt, the places do not only ſay, that the Societies of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are no part of the Church; but that the Church cannot be divided into more Societies than *one*; and they account Societies divided, which are either of a diverſe Faith or a diverſe Communion. Neither do they define *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks* in that manner as he does.

§. 13. For an *Heretick* in their Language is he, that oppoſes partinaciouſly the Common Faith of the Church: and a *Schiſmatick*, he that ſeparates from the *Catholick* Communion; never making any mention at all of the cauſe.

§. 14.

§. 14. And if his definition of a *Schiſmatick* may ſtand, then certainly there was no *Schiſmatick* ever in the World, nor none are at this day: for none did, none does ſeparate without ſome pretence of Error, or unlawfulneſs in the Conditions of the Churches Communion.

§. 15. And ſo I expect both a fuller and directer anſwer to my Argument, without excurſions, or diverſions into any other matter, till the judgment of Antiquity be cleared in this point.

Mr. *Chillingworths* Anſwer.

Ad §. 1. The *Minor* of my Argument, you ſay, is very weak, being grounded upon a falſe Suppoſition, That a Proteſtant could name no other Church profeſſing a diverſe Faith from the *Greek*, which was the *Catholick* Church: And your reaſon is, becauſe he might name the *Roman*. But in earneſt, Mr. *Lewgar*, do you think that a Proteſtant remaining a Proteſtant, can eſteem the *Roman* Church to be the Catholick Church? or do you think to put tricks upon us, with taking your propoſition one while *in ſenſu compoſito*, another while *in ſenſu diviſo*? For if your meaning was, that a Proteſtant not remaining, but ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, might name the *Roman* for the *Catholick*; ſo I ſay alſo to your diſcourſe, that a Proteſtant ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, might name a *Greek* to be the *Catholick* Church; and if there were any neceſſity to find out one Church of one denomination, as the *Greek*, the *Roman*, the Abyſſine, which *one* muſt be the *Catholick*? I ſee no reaſon, but he might pitch upon the *Greek* Church, as well as the *Roman*; I am ſure your diſcourſe proves nothing to the contrary. In ſhort, thus I ſay, if a *Grecian* ſhould go about to prove to a Proteſtant, that his Church is the *Catholick*, by ſaying (as you do for the *Roman*) ſome one was ſo before *Luther*, and you can name no other, therefore ours is ſo: Whatſoever may be anſwered to him, may be anſwered to you. For as you ſay, a Proteſtant, ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, may name to him the *Roman*; ſo I ſay, a Proteſtant, ceaſing to be a Proteſtant, may name to you the *Grecian*. If you

you ſay, a Proteſtant, remaining a Proteſtant, can name no other but the *Roman*, for the *Catholick*; I may (very ridiculouſly I confeſs, but yet as truly) ſay, he can name no other but the *Grecian*. If you ſay, he cannot name the *Greek Church* neither, remaining a Proteſtant; I ſay likewiſe, neither remaining a Proteſtant, can he name the *Roman* for the *Catholick*. So the Argument is equal in all reſpects on both ſides; and therefore either concludes for both parts (which is impoſſible, for then contradictions ſhould be both true) or elſe (which is certain) it concludes for neither. And therefore I ſay, your ground you build on, That before *Luther* ſome Church of one denomination was the *Catholick* (if it were true, as it is moſt falſe) would not prove your intent. It would deſtroy perhaps our Church, but it would not build yours. It would prove peradventure, that we muſt not be Proteſtants, but it will be far from proving that we muſt be *Papiſts*. For after we have left being Proteſtants (I tell you again that you may not miſtake) there is yet no neceſſity of being *Paviſts*; no more than if I go out of *England*, there is a neceſſity of going to *Rome*. And thus much to ſhew the poorneſs of your ground, if it were true. Now in the ſecond place, I ſay it is falſe, neither have you proved any thing to the contrary.

Ad §. 2. You ſay, the Authorities you have produced, ſhew to any that conſider them well, That the Church could never be divided into more Societies than *one*; and you mean (I hope) *one* in external Communion, or elſe you daily in ambiguities; and then I ſay, I have well conſidered the alledged authorities, and they appear to me to ſay no ſuch thing; but only, that the Societies of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are no true members of the Church: Whereas I put the caſe of two ſuch Societies, which were divided in external Communion by reaſon of ſome overvalued difference between them, and yet were neither of them Heretical or Schiſmatical. To this I know you could not anſwer, but only by ſaying, That this ſuppoſition was impoſſible; *viz.* That of two Societies divided in external Communion, neither ſhould be Heretical nor Schiſmatical;

Schiſmatical; and therefore I deſired you to prove by one convincing Argument, that this is impoſſible. This you have not done, nor I believe can do; and therefore all your places fall ſhort of your intended concluſion; and if you would put them into Syllogiſtical form, you ſhould preſently ſee you conclude from them Sophiſtically in that fallacy, which is called *A dicto ſecundum quid, ad dictum Simpliciter.* Thus, — No two divided Societies, whereof one is Heretical or Schiſmatical, can be both members of the *Catholick Church:* therefore ſimply no two divided Societies can be ſo: the Antecedent I grant, which is all that your places ſay, as you ſhall ſee anon; but the conſequence is Sophiſtical, and therefore that I deny: It is no better nor worſe than if you ſhould argue thus; No true divided Societies, whereof one is Out-lawed and in Rebellion, are both members of the ſame Commonwealth; therefore ſimply no two divided Societies.

But againſt this you pretend, That the alledged places ſay not only, that the Societies of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are no parts of the Church; but that the Church cannot be divided into more Societies than *one*: And they account Societies divided, which are either of a diverſe Faith, or of a diverſe Communion: This is that which I would have proved, but as yet I cannot ſee it done. There be Eleven Quotations in all; ſeven of them ſpeak expreſly and formally of diviſion made by Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, *viz.* 1. 3, 4. 7. 9, 10, 11. Three other of them, (*viz.* 5, 6. 8.) though they uſe not the word, yet Mr. *Lewgar* knows they ſpeak of the *Donatiſts*, which were Schiſmaticks; and that by the relative particles *you* and *them* are meant the *Donatiſts*. And laſtly, the ſecond, Mr. *Lewgar* knows, ſays nothing but this, That an Hereticks cannot be accounted of that one Flock, which is the Church.

But to make the moſt of them that can be: The firſt ſaith, the Unity of the Church cannot be ſeparated at all, nor divided. This I grant, but then I ſay, every difference does not in the ſight of God divide this Unity: for then diverſity of Opinions ſhould do it; and ſo the *Jeſuits* and

and *Dominicans* ſhould be no longer members of the ſame Church. Or if every difference will not do it, why muſt it of neceſſity be always done by difference in Communion, upon an inſufficient ground, yet miſtaken for ſufficient? (for ſuch only I ſpeak of.) Sure I am, this place ſays no ſuch matter. The next place ſaies, the Flock is but one; and all the reſt, that the Church is but *one*, and that Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are not of it; which certainly was not the thing to be proved, but that of this one Flock, of this one Church, two Societies divided without juſt cauſe in Communion, might not be true and lively members; both in one Body Myſtical in the ſight of God, though divided in Unity in the ſight of men: It is true indeed, whoſoever is ſhut out from the Church on Earth, is likewiſe cut off from it before God in Heaven: but you know it muſt be *Clave non errante*; when the cauſe of abſciſſion is true and ſufficient.

Ad §. 3. If you ſay ſo, *you ſay no more than the Fathers*: but what evaſions and tergiverſations are theſe? Why do you put us off with *ifs* and *ands*? I beſeech you tell me, or at leaſt him that deſires to reap ſome benefit by our Conference, directly and Categorically, —— Do you ſay ſo, or do you ſay, it is not ſo? Were the Excommunicated Churches of *Aſia* ſtill members of the *Catholick Church* (I mean in Gods account) or were they not? but all damned for that horrible Hereſie of celebrating the Feaſt of *Eaſter* upon a diverſe day from the Weſtern Churches? If you mean honeſtly and fairly, anſwer directly to this Queſtion, and then you ſhall ſee what will come of it. Aſſure your ſelf, you have a Wolf by the Ears: If you ſay they were, you overthrow your own concluſions, and ſay that Churches divided in Communion may both be members of the *Catholick*. If they were not; then ſhall we have Saints and Martyrs in Heaven, which were no members of the *Catholick Roman Church*.

As for *Irenæus* his μὴ συγκόπτειν, and *Ruffinus* his —— *Abſcindere ab unitate corporis*; they imply no more but this at the moſt; That *Victor* (*quantum in ſe fuit*) did cut them off from the *External* Communion of the *Catholick Church*;

ſuppoſing, that for their Obſtinacy in their Tradition, they had cut themſelves off from the *internal* Communion of it: but that this ſentence of *Victors* was ratified in Heaven, and that they were indeed cut off from the myſtical Body of Chriſt, ſo far was *Irenæus* from thinking, that he, and in a manner all the other Biſhops, reprehended *Victor* for pronouncing this Sentence on them, upon a cauſe ſo inſufficient: which how they could ſay, or poſſibly think of a Sentence ratified by God in Heaven, and not reprehend God himſelf, I deſire you to inform me: and if they did not intend to reprehend the Sentence of God himſelf, together with *Victors*, then I believe it will follow unavoidably, that they did not conceive, nor believe *Victors* Sentence to be ratified by God; and conſequently did not believe, that theſe excommunicated Churches were not in Gods account true members of the Body of Chriſt.

Ad §. 4. And here again, we have another ſubterfuge, by a Verbal diſtinction between Excommunication, and voluntary ſeparation: As if the ſeparation, which the Church of *Rome* made in *Victors* time from the *Aſian Churches*, were not a voluntary ſeparation; or as if the Churches of *Aſia*, did not voluntarily do that which was the cauſe of their ſeparation; or as if (though they ſepated not themſelves indeed, conceiving the cauſe to be inſufficient) they did not yet remain voluntarily ſeparated, rather than conform themſelves to the Church of *Rome*: Or laſtly, as if the *Grecians* of Old, or the Proteſtants of Late, might not pretend as juſtly as the *Aſian* Churches, that their Separation too was not voluntarily, but of neceſſity; for that the Church of *Rome* required of them under pain of Excommunication ſuch conditions of her Communion, as were neither neceſſary nor lawful to be performed.

Ad §. 5. And here again the matter is ſtreightned by another limitation. Both ſides (ſay you) muſt claim to be the Church: but what then, if one of them only claim (though vainly) to be the Church, and the other content it ſelf with being a part of it? Theſe then it ſeems

for

(for any thing you have ſaid to the contrary) may be both members of the *Catholick Church*: And certainly this is the caſe now, between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*: and for ought I know, was between the Church of *Rome* and the Church of *Greece*: For I believe, it will hardly be proved, that the Excommunication between them was mutual; nor that the Church of *Greece* eſteems it ſelf the whole Church, and the Church of *Rome* no Church but it ſelf a ſound member of the Church, and that a corrupted one.

Again, whereas you ſay, the Fathers ſpeak of a voluntary ſeparation; certainly they ſpeak of any Separation by Hereticks; and ſuch were (in *Victors* judgment) the Churches of *Aſia*, for holding an opinion contrary to the Faith, as he eſteemed: Or if he did not, why did he cut them from the Communion of the Church? But the true difference is, The Fathers ſpeak of thoſe, which by your Church are eſteemed Hereticks, and are ſo; whereas the *Aſian* Churches were by *Victor* eſteemed Hereticks, but were not ſo.

Ad §. 6. But their Authorities produced ſhew no more, than what I have ſhewed; that the Church is but one in excluſion of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; and not that two particular Churches divided by miſtake upon ſome overvalued difference, may not be both parts of the *Catholick*.

Ad §. 7. But I deſire you to tell me, whether you will do this, if the Doctrines produced and confirmed by ſuch a conſent of Fathers, happen to be in the judgment of the Church of *Rome*, either not *Catholick*, or abſolutely Heretical. If you will undertake this, you ſhall hear farther from me: But if, when their places are produced, you will pretend (as ſome of your ſide do) that ſurely they are corrupted, having neither reaſon nor ſhew of reaſon for it; unleſs this may paſs for one (as perhaps it may, where reaſons are ſcarce) that they are againſt your Doctrine; or if you will ſay, they are to be interpreted according to the pleaſure of your Church, whether their words will bear it or no; then I ſhall but loſe my Labour;

for this is not to try your Church by the Fathers, but the Fathers by your Church.

The Doctrines which I undertake to juſtifie, by a greater conſent of Fathers than here you produce, for inſtance ſhall be theſe.

1. That Gods Election ſuppoſeth preſcience of mans Faith and perſeverance.

2. That God doth not predetermine men to all their Actions.

3. That the *Pope* hath no power in temporalties over Kings either directly or indirectly.

4. That the Biſhop of *Rome* may Err in his publick determinations of matters of Faith.

5. That the B. *Virgin* was guilty of Original ſin.

6. That the B. *Virgin* was guilty of actual ſin.

7. That the Communion was to be adminiſtred to the Laity in both kinds.

8. That the reading of the Scripture was to be denied to no man.

9. That the Opinion of the Millenaries is true.

10. That the Euchariſt is to be adminiſtred to Infants.

11. That the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine remains in the Euchariſt of her Conſecration.

12. That the Souls of the Saints departed enjoy not the Viſion of God before the Laſt day.

13. That at the day of judgment, all the Saints ſhall paſs through a purging fire.

All theſe propoſitions are held by your Church either Heretical, or at leaſt not *Catholical*; and yet in this promiſe of yours you have undertaken to believe them as firmly, as you now do this, That two divided Societies cannot be both members of the *Catholick Church*.

Ad §. 8. Is it not then the Anſwerers part to ſhew, that the proofs pretended are indeed no proofs? and doth not he prove no proofs (at leaſt in your mouth) who undertakes to ſhew, that an equal or greater number of the very ſame witneſſes is rejected by your ſelves in many other things? Either the conſent of the Fathers, in any Age or Ages, is infallible, and then you are to reject

ject it in nothing; or it is not ſo, and then you are not to urge it in any thing: As if the Fathers Teſtimonies againſt us were Swords and Spears, and againſt you bulruſhes.

Ad §. 9. In effect as if you ſhould ſay, If you anſwer not as I pleaſe, I will diſpute no longer. But you remember the proverb, —— will think of it. —— *Occaſionem quærit, qui cupit diſcedere.*

Ad §. 10. I pray tell me, Is not *Therefore* a note of an Illation, or a concluſion? And is not your laſt *therefore this, Therefore her judgment is to be reſted in?* which though it be not your firſt concluſion, yet yours it is, and you may not declaim it: and it is ſo near of kin to the former (in your judgment I am ſure) that they muſt ſtand or fall together: therefore he that ſpeaks pertinently for the diſproving of the one, cannot ſpeak impertinently towards the diſproving the other: and therefore you cannot ſo ſhift it off, but of neceſſity you muſt anſwer the Argument there urged, or confeſs it ingenuouſly to be unanſwerable.

Or if you will not anſwer any thing, where the contradiction of your firſt concluſion is not in terms inferred, then take it thus: If S. *Cyprian* and S. *Auſtin* did not think it neceſſary in matters of Faith to reſt in the judgment of the *Roman* Church and the adherents of it; Then either they thought not the *Catholick Churches* judgment neceſſary to be reſted on, or they thought not *that* the *Catholick Church.* But the Antecedent is true, and undeniably proved ſo by their Actions, and the conſequence Evident: Therefore the conſequent muſt be true in one or other part: But you will not ſay the former is true; it remains therefore, the latter muſt be, and that is —— That S. *Auſtin* and S. *Cyprian* did not think the Church of *Rome* and the adherents of it to be the Catholick Church.

Ad §. 11. But I tell you now, and have already told you, that in our diſcourſe before Mr. *Skinner* and Dr. *Sheldon* I anſwered your Major, as then you framed your Argument, as now your Minor thus — If you underſtand by

by *one company* of Chriſtians, *one* in External Communion, I deny your Major. For I ſay, that two ſeveral Societies of Chriſtians, which do not externally communicate together, may be both parts of the ſame Catholick Church: and what difference there is between this, and the concluſion I told you, you ſhould have proved, I do not well unſtand.

Ad §. 12. And is it poſſible you ſhould ſay ſo, when every one of the places carry this ſenſe in their forehead, and 7 of the 11 in terms expreſs it —— That they intended only to exclude Hereticks and Schiſmaticks from being parts of the Church: For if they did not, againſt whom did they intend them? *Pagans* lay no claim to the Church, therefore not againſt them: *Catholicks* they did not intend to exclude: I know not who remains beſides, but Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. Beſides the frequent oppoſition in them between —— *One Church* on the one ſide, and Hereticks and Schiſmaticks; who ſees not, that in theſe places they intended to exclude only theſe pretenders out of the Churches Unity?

Laſtly, whereas you ſay, that the places ſay —— That the Church cannot be divided; and that they account thoſe divided who are of a diverſe Faith, or a diverſe Communion: I tell you, that I have read them over and over, and unleſs my Eyes deceive, they ſay not one word of a *diverſe Communion.*

Ad §. 13. Whereas a *Heretick* in your Language, is he that oppoſeth pertinaciouſly the common Faith of the Church; —— In mine —— He is ſuch a one, as holds an Error againſt Faith with Obſtinacy: Verily a monſtrous difference between theſe definitions. To oppoſe and hold againſt (I hope) are all one: *Faith* and the *common Faith of the Church,* ſure are not very different: *pertinaciouſly* and *with Obſtinacy,* methinks might paſs for Synonimous; and ſeeing the parts agree ſo well, methinks the Total ſhould not be at great hoſtility. And for the definition of a *Schiſmatick,* if you like not mine (which yet I give you out of a Father) I pray take your own; and then ſhew me, (if you mean to do any thing) that where-

ſoever

ſoever there are two Societies of Chriſtians, differing in external Communion, one of them moſt be of neceſſity either Heretical, or Schiſmatical in your own ſenſe of theſe words. To the contrary, I have ſaid already, (and ſay it now again, that you may not forget it) the *Roman* and the *Aſian* Churches in *Victors* time, the *Roman* and the *African* in S. *Stephens* time differed in external Communion; and yet neither of them was *Heretical*; For they did not oppoſe pertinaciouſly the common Faith of the Church: Neither of them was *Schiſmatical*; for they did not ſeparate (never making mention of the cauſe at all) but were ſeparated by the *Roman* Church, and that upon ſome cauſe, though it were not ſufficient.

Ad §. 14. The *Donatiſt* did ſo (as *Facundus Hermianenſis* teſtifies:) but you are abuſed, I believe, with not diſtinguiſhing between theſe two — They did pretend, that the Church required of them ſome unlawful thing among the conditions of her Communion: and they did pretend, that it was unlawful for them to communicate with the Church. This I confeſs they did pretend; but it was in regard of ſome Perſons in the Church, with whom they thought it unlawful to communicate: But the former they did not pretend, (I mean while they continued meer Schiſmaticks,) *viz.* That there was any Error in the Church, or impiety in her publick ſervice of God: And this was my meaning in ſaying, — A Schiſmatick is he, which ſeparates from the Church without pretence of Error, or unlawfulneſs in the conditions of her Communion: Yet if I had left out the term *unlawfulneſs*, the definition had been better, and not obnoxious to this Cavillation; and ſo I did in the ſecond Paper which I ſent you for your direction; which if you had dealt candidly, you ſhould have taken notice of.

Ad §. 15. I have replied (as I think) fully to every part and particle of your Argument. Neither was the Hiſtory of S. *Cyprians* and S. *Auſtins* oppoſition to the Church of *Rome* an excurſion or diverſion; but a cleer demonſtation of the contradictory of your concluſion: (*viz.* *That the* Roman *Church*, &c. *and therefore her judgment not to be reſted*

*ſted upon*) For an anſwer hereto I ſhall be very importunate with you; and therefore, if you deſire to avoid trouble, I pray come out of my debt as ſoon as may be.

If it be ſaid, that my Argument is not contradictory to your concluſion; becauſe it ſhews only, that the *Roman* Church with her adherents was not in S. *Cyprians* or S. *Auſtins* time the Catholick Church, but was at the time before *Luther*; I ſay, to conclude the one is to conclude the other. For certainly, if it were then at *Luthers* time ſo, it was always ſo; if it was not always, it was not then: for if it be of the eſſence, or neceſſary to the Church (as is pretended) to be a Society of Chriſtians joyned in Communion with the Church and Biſhop of *Rome*; then did it always agree to the Church; and therefore in S. *Cyprians* and S. *Auſtins* time, as well as at *Luthers* riſing: if it were not always, particularly not in S. *Cyprians* time, of the Eſſence or neceſſary to the Church to be ſo; then it was impoſſible the Church ſhould acquire this Eſſence, or this property afterwards, and therefore impoſſible it ſhould have it at the time of *Luthers* riſing. *Neceſſarium eſt, quod non aliquando ineſt, aliquando non ineſt, alicui ineſt, alicui non ineſt; ſed quod ſemper & omni.* Ariſt. Poſt. Analyt.

Again, every Sophiſter knows, that of Particulars nothing can be concluded; and therefore he that will ſhew, that the Church of *Rome* and the adherents of it was the Catholick Church at *Luthers* riſing; He muſt argue thus; —— It was always ſo, therefore then it was ſo: Now this Antecedent is overthrown by any Inſtance to the contrary; and ſo the firſt Antecedent being proved falſe, the firſt conſequent cannot but be falſe; for what Reaſon can be imagined, that the Church of *Rome* and the Adherents of it, was not the whole Catholick Church at S. *Cyprians* time, and was at *Luthers* riſing? If you grant (as I think you cannot deny) that a Church divided from the Communion of the *Roman*, may be ſtill in truth and in Gods account a part of the Catholick (which is the thing we ſpeak of:) then I hope Mr. *Lewgars* Argument from Unity of Communion is fallen to the ground; and it will be no good Plea to ſay, Some

Some one Church, not conſiſting of divers Communions, was the Catholick Church at *Luthers* riſing:

No one Church can be named to be the Catholick Church, but the *Roman:*

Therefore the *Roman* Church was the Catholick at *Luthers* riſing.

For Mr. *Lewgar* hath not nor cannot prove the Major of this ſyllogiſm certainly true; but to the contrary I have proved, that it cannot be certainly true, by ſhewing divers inſtances, wherein divers divided Communions have made up the Catholick Church: and therefore not the dividing of the Communions, but the cauſe and ground of it, is to be regarded, whether it be juſt and ſufficient, or unjuſt and inſufficient.

Neither is the Biſhop or Church of *Rome*, with the Adherents of it, an infallible Judge thereof; for it is evident, both he and it have erred herein divers times; which I have evinced already by divers examples, which I will not repeat; but add to them one confeſſed by Mr. *Lewgar* himſelf in his diſcourſe upon the Article of the Catholick Church, pag. 84. *S.* Athanaſius *being excommunicated (though by the* [a] *whole Church) yet might remain a member of Chriſts body, (not viſible, for that is impoſſible,* [b] *that a perſon cut off from viſible Communion, though unjuſtly, ſhould be a viſible member of the Church, but) by inviſible Communion, by reaſon of the invalidity of the ſentence; which being unjuſt, is valid enough to viſible exciſion, but not farther.*

[a] How by the whole Church, when himſelf was part of it, and communicated ſtill with divers other parts of it?

[b] What not to them who know and believe him to be unjuſtly Excommunicated?

## II. *A Diſcourſe againſt the Infallibility of the* Roman Church, *with an Anſwer to all thoſe Texts of Scripture that are alledged to prove it.*

THE Condition of Communion with the Church of *Rome*, without the performance whereof no man can be received into it, is this, That he believe firmly and without doubting, whatſoever that Church requires him to believe.

It is impoſſible that any man ſhould certainly believe any thing, unleſs that thing be either evident of it ſelf (as that twice two are four; that every whole is greater than a part of it ſelf) or unleſs he have ſome certain reaſon (at leaſt ſome ſuppoſed certain reaſon) and infallible guide for his belief thereof.

The Doctrins which the Church of *Rome* requireth to be believed are not *evident of themſelves*; for then every one would grant them at firſt hearing without any further proof. He therefore that will believe them, muſt have ſome certain and infallible ground whereupon to build his belief of them.

There is no other ground for a mans belief of them, eſpecially in many points, but only an aſſurance of the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*.

Now this point of that Churches Infallibility, is not evident of it ſelf; for then no man could chuſe but in his heart believe it without farther proof. Secondly, it were in vain to bring any proof of it, as vain as to light a Candle to ſhew men the Sun. Thirdly, it were impoſſible to bring any proof of it, ſeeing nothing can be more evident, than that which of it ſelf is evident: and nothing can be brought in proof of any thing which is not more evident than that matter to be proved: But now experience teacheth that millions there are, which have heard talk of the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, and yet do not believe that the defenders of it do not think it either vain or impoſſible to go about to prove it; and from hence it follows plainly, that this point is not evident of it ſelf.

Neither

Neither is there any other certain ground for any mans belief of it: or if there be, I desire it may be produced, as who am ready and most willing to submit my judgment to it, fully perswaded that none can be produced, that will endure a severe and impartial examination.

If it be said, The *Roman* Church is to be believed infallible because the Scripture says it is so.

1. I demand how shall I be assured of the Texts that be alledged, that they are indeed Scripture, that is, the Word of God? And the answer to this must be either because the Church tells me so, or some other: if any other be given, then all is not finally resolved into, and built upon that Churches Authority; and this answer then I hope a Protestant may have leave to make use of, when he is put to that perillous Question; *How know you the Scripture to be the Scripture?* If the answer be, because the Church tells me so: my reply is ready; that to believe that Church is infallible, because the Scriptures say so: and that the Scripture is the word of God, because the same Church says so, is nothing else but to believe the Church is infallible, because the Church says so, which is infallible.

2. I could never yet from the beginning of *Genesis*, to the end of the *Apocalypse*, find it written so much as once in expres terms, or equivalently, that the Church in subordination to the Sea of *Rome* shall be always infallible.

3. If it be said, that this is drawn from good consequence from Scripture truly interpreted; I demand, what certain ground have I to warrant me, that this consequence is good and this interpretation true: and if answer be made, that reason will tell me so: I reply, 1. That this is to build all upon my own reason and private interpretation. 2. I have great reason to fear, that reason assures no man, that the infallibility of the Church of *Rome* may be deduced from Scripture, by good and firm consequence.

4. If it be said, that a Consent of Fathers do so interpret the Scripture. I answer, 1. That this is most false and cannot without impudence be pretended, as I am ready to justifie to any indifferent Hearer. 2. I demand, who shall be judge whether the Fathers mean as is pretended.

If it be ſaid, reaſon will tell me ſo: I ſay, 1. this is falſe. 2. This is again to do that which is objected to Proteſtants for ſuch a horrid crime, that is, to build all finally upon reaſon.

If it be ſaid, they are ſo interpreted by the Catholick Church; I demand, whether by the Catholick Church be meant that onely that is in ſubordination to the Biſhop of *Rome*, or any other with that, or beſides that. If any other, it is falſe and impudent to pretend that they ſo underſtand the Fathers or Scriptures: If that only, then this is to ſay, that that Church is infallible, becauſe it may be deduced from Scripture that it is ſo; and to prove that it may be deduced from Scripture, becauſe the Fathers ſay ſo; and to prove the Fathers do ſay and mean ſo, becauſe the Church of *Rome* ſays they do ſo. And then what a ſtir and trouble was here to no purpoſe; why was it not rather ſaid plainly at the beginning; The Church of *Rome* is certainly infallible, becauſe ſhe her ſelf ſays ſo; and ſhe muſt ſay true becauſe ſhe is infallible: and that is as much to ſay as unleſs you grant me the Queſtion, I neither can nor will diſpute with you.

If it is ſaid, indeed the Fathers do not draw this doctrin from Scripture, but yet they affirm it with a full conſent, as a matter of Tradition. I reply. 1. That this pretence alſo is falſe, and that upon tryal it will not appear to have any colour of probability to any who remembers, that it is the preſent *Roman* Church, and not the Catholick Church whoſe infallibility is here diſputed. 2. I demand, who ſhall be judge, whether the Fathers do indeed affirm this or no: If reaſon, then again we are fallen upon that dangerous Rock, that all muſt be reſolved into private reaſon: If the Church I ask again, what Church is meant? If the Church of the *Grecians* or *Abyſſines* or Proteſtants, or any other but the *Roman*, it is evident they deny it. If the Church of *Rome*, then we are again very near the head of the Circle. For I ask, how ſhall I be aſſured this Church will not err and deceive me in interpreting the Fathers; and the Anſwer muſt be either none, or this, that the Church is infallible.

*Obj.*

*Obj.* If it be ſaid, that the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church would yield the Church ſo many commodities, and that the want of an infallible Church to guide men in the way to Heaven, would bring ſo many miſchiefs upon the world, that it cannot be thought but that God out of his love to men, hath appointed this Church as an infallible guide to all other Churches; ſeeing it is ſo neceſſary there ſhould be ſome ſuch guide, and ſo evident there is no other.

*Anſ.* I anſwer, that this argument would ſerve the Church of *Greece*, or *England*, or *Geneva*, to prove it ſelf infallible, and the guide of all other Churches, would they but take upon them to be ſo. For every one might ſay for it ſelf; It is neceſſary there ſhould be ſome Guide; it is evident there is no other; *Ergo* I am appointed by God to be that Guide. The ſame argument any man might uſe, to make himſelf Monarch of any popular State: for firſt he might repreſent unto them the commodities of a Monarchy, and the miſchiefs of a Democracy: then he might ſay, That God ſurely out of his Love to them hath appointed ſome remedy for their inconveniences: And laſtly, that he hath ordained no other to redreſs them but himſelf, and then conclude, that he alone muſt of neceſſity be the man appointed to rule over them.

I anſwer Secondly, that here alſo we muſt reſolve all into Reaſon and the private Spirit, or that we are ſtill in the Circle. For I demand, how do you know that theſe pretended commodities are to be compaſſed, and theſe pretended miſchiefs are to be avoided, only by the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome* or ſome other Church, and not by any other means which God hath provided. If you ſay, reaſon tells you ſo; I ſay 1. This is to make reaſon your laſt and loweſt foundation. 2. I aſſure you Reaſon tells me no ſuch matter, and yet I know that I am as willing to hear it as you are. If you ſay, the Church tells you ſo, and ſhe is infallible; this, I ſay, is to prove the Church infallible becauſe ſhe is ſo.

Thirdly, I demand, How it is poſſible you ſhould know, that theſe pretended commodities might not be gained, and

and theſe miſchiefs which you fear avoided, without any aſſiſtance of the Church of *Rome*'s infallibility, if all men in the world did believe the Scripture, and live according to it, and would require no more of others, but to do ſo? If you ſay, that notwithſtanding this, there would be no unity in Doctrin: I anſwer 1. It is impoſſible you ſhould know this; conſidering that there are many places in Scripture, which do more than problably import, that the want of piety in living, is the cauſe of want of unity in believing. 2. That there would be unity of Opinion in all things neceſſary: and that in things not neceſſary unity of Opinion is not neceſſary. But laſtly, that notwithſtanding differences in theſe things of leſſer importance, there might and would be unity of Communion, unity of charity and affection, which is one of the greateſt bleſſings which the world is capable of; abſolute unity of opinion being a matter rather to be deſired than hoped for.

*Obj.* Againſt this it has been objected, that the Scripture cannot be the guide, becauſe many men have uſed their beſt endeavors to follow it, and yet have fallen, ſome into *Arianiſm*, others into *Pelagianiſm*, others into other damnable Hereſies, and how can I ſecure any man, but he may do the like?

*Anſ.* To this I anſwer, by diſtinguiſhing the perſons which are pretended to have made uſe of this Guide, and yet to have fallen into Hereſie, that they were either ſuch as did love the truth ſincerely and above all things, as did ſeek it diligently and with all their power, to this intent that they might conform their belief and life unto it; ſuch as following S. *Pauls* direction, did firſt try all things deliberately, and then choſe what in their conſcience they thought was beſt: or they were ſuch as for want of the love of the truth, God ſuffered to fall into ſtrong deluſions, to fall to a falſe Religion, becauſe they brought not forth the fruits of the true; to make ſhipwreck of their faith, becauſe they had caſt away a good conſcience; to have their Eyes blinded, and their light taken away, becauſe they made not the right uſe of it, but were idle and

un-

unprofitable, and ſet their hearts upon vanity, and had only a form of Religion, but denied the effect of it in their lives and converſations; in a word, ſuch as were betrayed to their Error, and kept for ever in it, either by negligence in ſeeking the Truth, or unwillingneſs to find it, or by ſome other voluntary ſin: And for theſe I dare not flatter them with hope of pardon; but let me tell you, it is not the error of the underſtanding, but the ſin of their will that truly and properly damns them: But for the former I am confident, that nothing is more contumelious to the goodneſs of God, than to think that he will damn any ſuch; for he ſhould damn men that truly love him, and deſire to ſerve him, for doing that which all things conſidered, was impoſſible for them not to do.

*Obj.* If it is ſaid, that pride of their own underſtanding made them not ſubmit to the Church of *Rome*, and to her guidance, and that for this, being a voluntary ſin, they may be juſtly damned.

*Anſ.* I anſwer, that whether the Church of *Rome* be the guide of all men is the Queſtion, and therefore not to be begged but proved: that the man we ſpeak of is very willing to follow this Guide, could he find any good ground to believe it is his Guide; and therefore the reaſon he follows her not, is not pride but ignorance: that as it is humility to obey thoſe whom God hath ſet over us, ſo it is credulity to follow every one that will take upon him to lead us: that if the *blind lead the blind*, not only the *leader* but the *follower* ſhall periſh: Laſtly, that the preſent Church of *Rome* pretends very little and indeed nothing of moment, to get the office of being Head and Guide of the Church, which Antichriſt when he cometh, may not and will not make uſe of, for the very ſame end and purpoſe; and therefore he had reaſon, not to be too ſudden and precipitate, in committing himſelf to the conduct of the Pope, for fear of miſtaking Antichriſt for the Vicar of Chriſt.

*Obj.* But in all Commonwealths, it is neceſſary there ſhould be not only a Law for men to live by, but alſo a living and ſpeaking Judge to decide their differences ariſing about

about the various Interpretations of the Law, and otherwiſe Controverſies would be endleſs: therefore if ſuch a judge be ſo neceſſary in civil affairs, for the procuring and preſerving our temporal peace and happineſs; how much more neceſſary is he, for the deciding of thoſe Controverſies, that concern the ſaving and damning of our ſouls for ever.

*Anſ.* Hereunto I anſwer, 1. That if it were as evident and certain that God hath appointed the Pope or Church of *Rome* to be the Guide of Faith, and Judge of Controverſies, as that the King hath appointed ſuch a one to be Lord Chief Juſtice, the having of ſuch a Guide would be very available, for to preſerve the Church in Unity, and to conduct mens ſouls to Heaven: but a Judge that has no better title or evidence to his place, than the Pope has to that which he pretends to, a Judge that is doubtful and juſtly queſtionable whether he be the Judge or no, is in all probability likely to produce clean contrary effects, and to be himſelf one of the Apples of ſtrife, one of the greateſt ſubjects of Controverſie, and occaſion of diſſentions.

And to avoid this great inconvenience, if God had intended the Pope or Church of *Rome* for this great Office, certainly he would have ſaid ſo very plainly and very frequently; if not frequently, certainly ſometimes, once at leaſt he would have ſaid ſo in expreſs terms: but he does not ſay ſo, no not ſo much as once, nor any thing from whence it may be collected, with any ſure or firm conſequence: therefore if it be not certain, certainly it is very probable he never meant ſo.

Again, in Civil Controverſies the caſe can hardly be ſo put, that there ſhould be any neceſſity that the ſame man ſhould be Judge and Party: but in matters of Religion, wherein all have equal intereſt, every man is a party, and engaged to judge for temporal reſpects, this way or that way, and therefore not fit to be a Judge. But what then if he which was with ſo much clamor and ſo little reaſon vouched, for the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, do tell you plainly, there is no living Judge on Earth appointed by God, to decide the Controverſies ariſing amongſt Chriſtians;

Chriſtians; nor no way to determine them but Scripture. His words are expreſs and formal, and need no other commentary but a true interpretation.

## Optatus Melevit. *lib.* 5. ad princip.

*Vos dicitis,* Licet; *nos, non* Licet: *inter Veſtrum* Licet, *& noſtrum* non Licet, *nutant & remigant animæ populorum. Nemo vobis credat, nemo nobis; omnes contentioſi homines ſumus. Quærendi ſunt judices: ſi Chriſtiani, de utrâque parte dari non poſſunt: de foris quærendus eſt Judex. Si* Paganus, *non poteſt noſſe Chriſtiana Secreta: Si* Judæus, *inimicus eſt Chriſtiani Baptiſmatis. Ergo in terris de hac re nullum poterit reperiri judicium: de cœlo quærendus eſt Judex. Sed ut quid pulſamus cœlum, cum habeamus hic in Evangelio Teſtamentum? Quia hoc loco rectè poſſunt terrenæ cœleſtibus comparari; tale eſt, quod quivis hominum habens numeroſos filios: His, quamdiu preſens eſt, ipſe imperat ſingulis; non eſt adhuc neceſſarium Teſtamentum. Sic & Chriſtus, quamdiu præſens in terris fuit (quamvis nec modo deſit) pro tempore quicquid neceſſarium erat, Apoſtolis imperavit. Sed quomodo terrenus pater cùm ſe in confinio ſenſerit mortis, timens ne poſt mortem ſuam ruptâ pace litigent fratres, adhibitis teſtibus voluntatem ſuam de pectore morituro transfert in tabulas diù duraturas; & ſi fuerit inter fratres contentio nata, non itur ad tumulum, ſed quæritur Teſtamentum, & qui in tumulo quieſcit, tacitis de tabulis loquitur vivus. Is, cujus eſt teſtamentum, in cœlo eſt: Ergo voluntas ejus velut in Teſtamento ſic in Evangelio inquiratur.*

That is, "You ſay ſuch a thing is *Lawful*; we ſay it is "*Unlawful*: the minds of the People are doubtful and "wavering between your *lawful* and our *unlawful*. Let "no man believe either *you* or *us*; we are all contentious "men. We muſt ſeek therefore for Judges between us. "If Chriſtians are to be our Judges; both ſides will not af-"ford ſuch. We muſt ſeek for a Judge abroad. If he be "a *Pagan*, he cannot know the ſecrets of Chriſtianity: "If he be a *Jew*, he is an Enemy to Chriſtian Baptiſm. "Therefore there is no judgment of this matter can be "found on Earth. We muſt ſeek for a Judge from Hea-

"ven. But to what end do we ſollicite Heaven, when "we have here in the Goſpel a Will and Teſtament? And "becauſe here we may fitly compare Earthly things with "Heavenly; The caſe is juſt as if a man had many Sons: "while he is preſent with them, he commands every one "what he will have done; and there is no need as yet of "making his laſt Will. So alſo Chriſt, as long as he was "preſent on Earth (though neither now is he wanting) "for a time commanded his Apoſtles, whatſoever was "neceſſary. But juſt as an Earthly Father, when he "feels his Death approaching, fearing leſt after his Death "the Brothers ſhould fall out and quarrel, he calls in Wit-"neſſes, and tranſlates his Will from his dying Heart into "Writing-Tables that will continue long after him: Now "if any controverſie ariſes among the Brothers; they do "not go to his Tomb, but conſult his laſt Will; and thus "he whilſt he reſts in his Grave, does ſpeak to them in thoſe "ſilent Tables as if he were alive. He whoſe Teſta-"ment we have, is in Heaven. Therefore we are to en-"quire his pleaſure in the Goſpel, as in his laſt Will and "Teſtament.

It is plain from hence, that he knew not of any living, ſpeaking, audible Judge, furniſhed with Authority and infallibility to decide this controverſie: had he known any ſuch aſſiſted with the Spirit of God for this purpoſe, it had been horrible impiety againſt God and the Churches peace, to ſay there was none ſuch: or the Spirit of God was not able by his aſſiſtance to keep this Judge from being hindred with partiality, from ſeeing the Truth. Had he thought the Biſhop of *Romes* ſpeaking *ex Cathedra* to be this Judge, now had been the time to have ſaid ſo: but he ſays directly the contrary, and therefore it is plain, he knew of no ſuch Authority he had.

Neither is there the like reaſon for a Judge finally and with Authority to determine controverſies in Religion and civil differences: For if the controverſie be about *Mine* and *Thine*, about Land or Money or any other thing, it is impoſſible that both I ſhould hold the poſſeſſion of it and my adverſary too: and one of us muſt do injury

to

to the other, which is not fit it ſhould be Eternal: But in matters of Doctrine the caſe is clean contrary; I may hold my opinion and do my Adverſary no wrong, and my Adverſary may hold his and do me none.

## [ *Texts of Scripture alledged for Infallibility.* ]

The Texts alledged for it by *Cardinal Perron* and Mr. *Stratford*, are partly Prophecies of the *Old Teſtament*, partly promiſes of the *New*.

1. Eſa. 1. 26. *Thou ſhalt be called the City of Juſtice, the faithful City.*

2. Eſa. 52. 1. *Through thee ſhall no more paſs any that is uncircumciſed, or unclean.*

3. Eſa. 59. 21. *As for me, this is my Covenant with them, ſaith the Lord, my ſpirit that is upon thee, and my Words which I have put in thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, ſaith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*

4. Eſa. 62. 6. *Upon thy Walls* Hieruſalem *I have appointed Watchmen all the day and all the night for ever, they ſhall not hold their peace.*

5. Jerem. 31. 33. *This ſhall be the Covenant which I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *ſaith the Lord, I will give my Law in their Bowels, and in their Heart I will write it, and I will be their God, and they ſhall be my People.*

6. Ezek. 36. 27. *I will put my Spirit within you, and cauſe you to walk in my Statutes, and ye ſhall keep my judgments and do them.*

7. Ezek. 37. 26. *I will give my Sanctification in the midſt of them for ever.*

8. Oſe. 2. 19, 20. *I will diſpouſe thee to me for ever; and I will diſpouſe thee to me in Juſtice and judgment, and in mercy and commiſerations; I will Eſpouſe thee to me in Faith, and thou ſhalt know that I am the Lord.*

9. Cant. 4. 7. *Thou art all fair my Love, and there is no ſpot in thee.*

Now before we proceed further, let us reflect upon theſe places, and make the moſt of them for the behoof

of the *Roman* Church; and I believe it will then appear to any one not veil'd with prejudice, that not one of them reaches home to the concluſion intended, which is, That the *Roman* Church is infallible.

The firſt place perhaps would do ſomething, but that there are Three main exceptions againſt it. 1. That here is no evidence, not ſo much as that of probability, that this is here ſpoken of the Church of *Rome*. 2. That it is certain that it is not ſpoken of the Church of *Rome*; but of the Nation of the *Jews*, after their converſion, as is apparent from that which follows. *Zion ſhall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteouſneſs.* 3. That it is no way certain, that whatſoever Society may be called, *the City of righteouſneſs, the faithful City*, muſt be infallible in all her Doctrine: with a great deal more probability, it might challenge from hence the priviledg of being *Impeccable*; which yet *Roman Catholicks* I believe do not pretend to.

The Second place is liable to the ſame exceptions; the Church of *Rome* is not ſpoken of in it: but *Zion* and *Hieruſalem*; and it will *ſerve as well nay* better to prove *Impeccability* than *Infallibility*.

The third place is the *Achilles* for this opinion, wherein every writer Triumphs; but I wonder they ſhould do ſo; conſidering the Covenant here ſpoken of is made, not with the Church of *Rome*, but with *Zion* and them that turn from tranſgreſſion in *Jacob*, the words are: *And the Redeemer ſhall come out of* Zion, *and unto them that turn from tranſgreſſion in* Jacob *ſaith the Lord. As for me, this is my Covenant with them ſaith the Lord; My Spirit that is in thee and my Words*, &c. Now if the Church of *Rome* be *Zion* and they that turn from iniquity in *Jacob*, they may have Title to this Covenant; if not they muſt forbear, and leave it to the *Jews* after their Converſion; to whom it is appropriated by a more Infallible Interpreter than the *Pope*; I mean S. *Paul*, Rom. 11. 26. And it ſeems the Church of *Rome* alſo believes as much: for otherwiſe why does ſhe in the Margent of her Bible, ſend us to that place of S. *Paul* for an expoſition.

Read

Read the 4th place, and you ſhall find nothing can be made of it but this: that the Watchmen of *Hieruſalem* ſhall never ceaſe importuning God, for the ſending of the *Meſſias*: To this purpoſe ſpeaks the Prophet in *ver.* 1. *For* Zions *ſake I will not hold my peace,* and for *Hieruſalems ſake I well not reſt, until the righteouſneſs thereof go forth as brightneſs*: And the *Gentiles ſhall ſee thy righteouſneſs.* But the words following theſe that are objected, make it moſt evident, which are, *ye that make mention of the Lord keep not ſilence, and give him no reſt, till he eſtabliſh and till he make* Hieruſalem *a praiſe in the Earth.*

The 5th place had they ſet down entirely, for very ſhame they could not have urged it for the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church. The words are, *Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, that I will make a new Covenant with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and with the Houſe of* Judah; *not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers —— But this ſhall be the Covenant that I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael —— *After thoſe days, ſaith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward parts and write it in their Hearts, and I will be their God and they ſhall be my People; and they ſhall teach no more every man his Neighbour and every man his Brother, ſaying, know the Lord; for they ſhall all know me from the leaſt of them to the greateſt of them, ſaith the Lord.* And now I have tranſcribed the place, I think it ſuperfluous to make any other anſwer.

The ſame Anſwer and no other will I make alſo to the 6th place. The words are. *Therefore ſay unto the Houſe of* Iſrael; *thus ſaith the Lord God, I do not this for your ſakes O Houſe of* Iſrael, *but for my holy names ſake,* ver. 22. *I will take you from among the Heathen, and gather you out of all Countries, and will bring you into your own Land,* v. 24. *Then will I ſprinkle clean Water upon you,* ver. 25. *A new heart alſo will I give you,* ver. 26. *And I will put my Spirit in you and cauſe you to walk in my Statutes, and ye ſhall keep my judgments and do them,* ver. 27. *And ye ſhall dwell in the Land that I gave to your Fathers: I will alſo ſave you from all your uncleanneſſes, and I will call for the Corn and will encreaſe it, and lay no Famine upon you. And the deſolate Land*

*ſhall*

*ſhall be tilled*, ver. 34. *And they ſhall ſay, this Land that was deſolate, is become like the Garden of* Eden.

The 7th place alſo carries its anſwer in its forehead: *Thus ſaith the Lord God, behold I will take the Children of* Iſrael *from among the* Heathen *whether they be gone; and I will make them one Nation in the Land upon the mountains of* Iſrael: *and one King ſhall be King to them all*, &c. to the end of the Chapter. In all which place, he that can find a Syllable of the Church of *Rome*, he muſt have better eyes than I have.

The next (8th) place would be very pregnant for the Church of *Rome*, if of courteſie we would grant, that whatſoever is promiſed to *Iſrael*, is intended to them. As you may ſee in the place at large, from *ver.* 17. to the end of the Chapter.

The 9th and laſt place out of the *Canticles*, had it been urged by a Proteſtant; it would have been thought a ſufficient Anſwer to have ſaid, That Myſtical Texts are not fit to argue upon; but if this will not ſerve, then we anſwer. 1. That there is no mention nor intimation of the Church of *Rome*. 2. That it proves either too much or nothing at all: that is, that the *Roman* Church is impeccable, as well as infallible; unleſs we will ſay that Errors only are Spots, and impieties are not.

## *Out of the* New Teſtament *they alledge theſe Texts.*

Matth. 16. 18. *Upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.*

But this is ſaid of the Catholick, not of the *Roman* Church: nor can it ever be proved that the Church in Communion with the See of *Rome* is the Catholick Church. Secondly, it ſays ſomething for the *perpetuity* of the Church, but not for the *Infallibility* of it: unleſs you will take for granted what can never be proved, That a Church that teaches any Erroneous Doctrine, is a Church no longer; which is all one, as if you ſhould ſay, a man that has the *Stone*, or *Gout*, or any other Diſeaſe, is not a man.

*They*

## *They urge,* Matth. 28. 19, 20.

*And I am with you all days, even unto the conſummation of the World.*

And here alſo if we will grant, 1. That by *you,* is meant you and only you of the Church of *Rome.* 2. That our Saviour has here obliged himſelf to aſſiſt, not only *Sufficienter,* but alſo *irreſiſtibiliter,* not only to preſerve in the Church a light of ſufficient direction, as he provided a Star for the Wiſe Men, and a Pillar of Fire and a cloud for the conduct of the *Iſraelites*; but alſo compel or at leaſt neceſſitate them to follow it. 3. That he will be with them, not only to keep them from all damnable and deſtructive Errors, but abſolutely form all erroneous Doctrines: If theſe things I ſay were granted, ſome good might be done. But certainly theſe are μεγάλα λίαν αἰτήματα, too great favours to be lookt for by ſtrangers: And yet if all this be granted, we ſhould run into this inconvenience on the other ſide; that if the promiſe be abſolute, not only the whole Church of *Rome*; not only a general Council; not the *Pope* alone; but every Biſhop, every Prieſt, every one who is ſent by Chriſt to Baptize and Preach the Goſpel, might claim this aſſiſtance by vertue of Chriſts words, and conſequently *Infallibility.*

## *They urge,* Matth. 18. 17.

*If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the* Heathen *and the* Publican. And here again the Church muſt be the Church of *Rome,* or we are as far to ſeek as ever. But what if by it be meant, which is moſt evident out of the place, every particular Church of Chriſtians, whereunto any one Chriſtian injured by another, may addreſs himſelf for remedy. Certainly whoſoever reads the place without prejudice, I am confident that he ſhall not deny, but that the ſenſe of the Words is. That if any Chriſtian injure another, and being firſt admoniſhed of it by him in private; then by him before two or three

three Witneſſes; Laſtly, by the Church he lives in; and yet ſtill proceeds on obſtinately in doing injury to his Brother, he is to be eſteemed as a *Heathen*, or a *Publican*: and then if Infallibility may be concluded, what a multitude of Infallible Churches ſhall we have?

*They urge*, Matth. 18. 20.

*Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.*

But this alſo either ſhoots ſhort, or over; either proves nothing, or too much: Either it proves not the Infallibility of the whole Church, or it proves the Infallibility of every part of it: Either not the Infallibility of General Councils, or the infallibility of particular Councils; for there two or three at leaſt are aſſembled in Chriſts name. But then beſides theſe two or three for ought I can ſee or gather from the Text, they may as well be of any other Church as the *Roman*.

*They urge*, Luke 10. 16.

*He that heareth you heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me.*

But this will not do you any ſervice, unleſs of favour we grant, that *you* here, is *you* of the Church of *Rome*; and but very little if that be granted: for then every Biſhop, every Prieſt muſt be Infallible. For there is not the meaneſt of the Meſſengers of Chriſt, but this may be verified of him, That he that heareth him, heareth Chriſt, and he that deſpiſeth him, deſpiſeth Chriſt.

*They urge out of* John 14. *ver.* 15, 16.

*I will ask my Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth.*

But here alſo, what warrant have we, by *you* to underſtand the Church of *Rome*: whereas he that compares *v.* 26. with

with this, ſhall eaſily perceive, that our Saviour ſpeaks only of the Apoſtles in their own perſons; for there he ſays going on in the ſame diſcourſe. *The Holy Ghoſt whom the Father will ſend in my name, he ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have ſaid to you:* which cannot agree but to the Apoſtles themſelves in perſon; and not to their Succeſſors, who had not yet been taught and therefore not forgotten any thing, and therefore could not have them brought to their remembrance. But what if it had been promiſed to them and their Succeſſors? had they no Succeſſors but them of the *Roman* Church? this indeed is pretended and cried up, but for proofs of it, *deſiderantur.*

Again, I would fain know whether there be any certainty, that every Pope is a good Chriſtian, or whether he may not be in the ſence of the Scripture, *of the World?* If not, how was it that *Bellarmine* ſhould have cauſe to think, that ſuch a rank of them went ſucceſſively to the Devil?

---

## III. *A Conference, concerning the Infallibility of the* Roman *Church: Proving that the preſent Church of* Rome *either errs in her worſhipping the Bleſſed Virgin* Mary, *or that the Ancient Church did err in condemning the* Collyridians *as* Hereticks.

1. *Demand.* WHether the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church, be not the foundation of their Faith which are members of that Church?

*Anſw.* The Infallibility of the Church is (not the foundation but) a part of their Faith who are members of the Church. And the *Roman* Church is held to be the Church, by all thoſe who are members of it.

*Reply.* That which is the laſt Reaſon, why you believe the Scripture to be the written Word of God and unwritten Traditions his unwritten word; and this or that to be the true ſenſe of Scripture, that is to you the foundation of your Faith, and ſuch unto you is the Infallible Authority of the *Roman* Church. Therefore upto you it is not only a part of your faith, but alſo ſuch a part as is the foundation of all other parts. Therefore you are deceived if you think, there is any more oppoſition between being a part of the faith and the foundation of other parts of it; than there is between being a part of a houſe and the foundation of it. But whether you will have it the foundation of your faith, or only a part of it, for the preſent purpoſe it is all one.

2. *Demand.* Whether the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church be not abſolutely overthrown, by proving the *preſent Roman* Church is in error, or that the *Ancient* was?

*Anſw.* It is, if the Error be in thoſe things wherein ſhe is affirmed to be infallible; *viz.* in points of Faith.

*Reply.* And this here ſpoken of, whether it be lawful to offer Tapers and Incenſe to the honour of the Bleſſed Virgin, is I hope a Queſtion concerning a point of Faith.

3. *Demand.* Whether offering a Cake to the Virgin *Mary*, be not as lawful, as to offer Incenſe and Tapers and divers other oblations to the ſame Virgin?

*Anſw.* It is as lawful to offer a Cake to her honour as Wax-Tapers, but neither the one, nor the other may be offered to her, or her honour, as the term or object of the Action. For to ſpeak properly, nothing is offered to her or to her honour, but to God in the honour of the Bleſſed Virgin. For Incenſe, it is a foul ſlander that it is offered any way to the Bleſſed Virgin; for that incenſing which is uſed in the time of Maſs, is ever underſtood by all ſorts of people to be directed to God only.

*Reply.* If any thing be offered to her, ſhe is the Object of that oblation; as if I ſee water, and through water ſomething elſe, the water is the object of my ſight, though not the laſt object. If I honour the Kings Deputy, and by him the King, the Deputy is the object of my action, though not the final object: And to ſay theſe things may be

be offered to her, but not as to the object of the action, is to ſay they may be offered to her, but not to her. For what elſe is meant by the object of an action, but that thing on which the action is imployed, and to which it is directed?

If you ſay, that by the object of the action, you mean the final object only wherewith the action is terminated; you ſhould then have ſpoken more properly and diſtinctly, and not have denied her ſimply to be the object of this action, when you mean only ſhe is not ſuch a kind of object: no more than you may deny a man to be a living creature, meaning only that he is not a horſe.

Secondly, I ſay, it is not required of *Roman* Catholicks when they offer Tapers to the Saints, that by an actual intention they direct their action actually to God; but it is held ſufficient, that they know and believe that the Saints are in Subordination and near Relation to God, and that they give this honour to the Saints becauſe of this relation: And to God himſelf rather habitually and interpretative, than actually, expreſly and formally. As many men honour the Kings Deputy, without having any preſent thought of the King, and yet their action may be interpreted an honour to the King, being given to his Deputy, only becauſe he is his Deputy, and for his relation to the King.

Thirdly, I ſay, there is no reaſon or ground in the world, for any man to think, that the *Collyridians* did not chuſe the Virgin *Mary* for the object of their worſhip, rather than any other Woman or any other Creature, meerly for her relation to Chriſt; and by conſequence there is no ground to imagine, but that at leaſt habitually and interpretative, they directed their action unto Chriſt, if not actually and formally. And *Ergo*, if that be a ſufficient defence for the Papiſts, that they make not the Bleſſed Virgin the final object of their worſhip, but worſhip her not for her own ſake, but for her relation unto Chriſt: *Epiphanius* ſurely did ill to charge the *Collyridians* with Hereſie, having nothing to impute to them, but only that he was informed, that they offered a Cake to the honour of the Bleſſed Virgin, which honour yet they might, and without queſtion did give unto her for her relation unto Chriſt,

and ſo made her not the laſt object and term of their worſhip: and from hence it is evident, that he conceived the very action it ſelf, ſubſtantially and intrinſically malitious, *i. e.* he believed it a ſin that they offered to her at all: and ſo by their action put her in the place of God, by giving unto her this worſhip proper to God; and not that they terminated their action finally in her, or did in very deed think her to be a God, and not a Creature.

*But to ſpeak properly*, you ſay, *nothing is offered to her or to her honour, but to God in honour of the Bleſſed Virgin.*

Belike then if through *Henly* I go from hence to *London*, I may not be ſaid properly to go to *Henly*, but only to *London:* or if through Water I ſee the Sand, I may not be properly ſaid to ſee the Water, but only the Sand. Away with ſuch ſhifting Sophiſtry; either leave your practice of offering to Saints if it be naught, or colour it not over with ſuch empty diſtinctions if it be good: Chriſt ſaith to his Apoſtles in regard of their relation to him, *He that heareth you heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you deſpiſeth me:* and yet who doubts, but they that heard the Apoſtles did properly hear them, and they that deſpiſed them did properly deſpiſe them, though their action ſtaid not in them, but reached up to Heaven and to Chriſt himſelf. You pray to Saints and Angels, though you do not terminate your prayers in them; and yet I doubt not but your prayers to Saints, may be as properly called prayers, as thoſe you make to God himſelf. For though theſe be of a more excellent nature than they, yet do they agree in the general nature, that they are both prayers. As though a Man be a more excellent living creature than a horſe, yet he agrees with him in this, that both are living creatures. But if nothing be properly offered to her or to her honor, why do you in your ſixth Anſwer ſay, you may offer any thing to the Virgin *Mary*, by way of preſents and gifts by the doctrin of the *Roman* Church? Certainly he that offers by way of gift or preſent, offers as properly as he that offers by way of ſacrifice; as a horſe is as properly a living creature as a Man.

But

But if it were ſo as you ſay (which is moſt falſe) that you did not properly offer to the Bleſſed Virgin, but to God in honour of her; yet in my judgment, this would not qualifie or mend the matter but make it worſe. For firſt, who taught you, that in the time of the Goſpel (after the accompliſhment of the prediction, *ſacrifice and offering thou wouldeſt not but a body haſt thou prepared me:* after this Interpretation of it in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews, He taketh away the firſt that he may eſtabliſh the ſecond)* that it is ſtill lawful to offer Tapers or Incenſe to God. Secondly, in my underſtanding, to offer to God in honour of the Virgin, is more derogatory from Gods honour, than to offer to her in the honour of God. For this is in my apprehenſion to ſubordinate God to her, to make her the terminating and final object of the action; to make God the way and her the end, and by and through God to conveigh the worſhip unto her.

*But for incenſe,* you ſay, *it is a foul ſlander, that it is offered any way to the Bleſſed Virgin.*

To this I anſwer, that your imputing ſlander to me, is it ſelf a ſlander: For 1. In your 5th Anſwer, you have given a clear intimation that you have never been out of *England*: ſo that you cannot certainly know, what is the practice of your Church in this point beyond Sea. And he that lives amongſt you, and has but half an Eye open and free from prejudice, cannot but ſee, that the *Roman* Religion is much more exorbitant in the general practice of it, than it is in the Doctrine publiſhed in Books of Controverſie; where it is delivered with much caution and moderation, nay cunning and diſſimulation that it may be the fitter to win and engage Proſelytes; who being once enſnared, though they be afterwards ſtartled with ſtrange and unlookt-for practices, yet a hundred to one, but they will rather ſtifle their Conſcience, and daſh all ſcruples againſt the pretended Rock of their Churches Infallibility, and blindly follow thoſe guides, to whoſe Conduct they have unadviſedly committed themſelves, than come off again with the ſhame of being reputed weak and inconſtant: ſo terrible an Idol is this vain nothing, *the opinion and cenſure of fooliſh men.* But

But to return again to you, I ſay your ignorance of the practice of the *Roman* Church beyond the Seas, does plainly convince that you have raſhly and therefore ſlanderouſly charged me with the Crime of ſlander. As for your reaſon you add, conſider it again, and you will ſee it is worth nothing. For what if incenſing in time of Maſs, be underſtood by all ſorts of People to be directed to God alone (which yet you cannot poſſibly know) yet this I hope hinders not, but that in Proceſſions, you may Incenſe the Images of the Saints, and conſequently (according to your Doctrine) do this Honour to the Saints themſelves repreſented by the Images. I my ſelf (unleſs I am very much miſtaken) was preſent when this very thing was done to the Picture of Saint *Benet* or Saint *Gregory* in the Cloyſter of Saint *Vedaſtus* in the Monaſtery in *Doway*.

But indeed what a ridiculous inconſequence is it, to think that Wax Tapers may lawfully be offered to the Saints and incenſe may not: or if Incenſe may not, which you ſeem to diſclaim as impious, that Wax Tapers may.

4. *Demand.* Whether the *Collyridians* were not condemned as Hereticks by the Ancient Church. Firſt, for offering a Cake upon a Anniverſary Feaſt to the Bleſſed Virgin. Secondly for that they did this not being Prieſts.

*Anſw.* The *Collyridians* were condemned as Hereticks for two things. Firſt, for imploying Women in the place and Office of Prieſts to offer a Cake (not in the nature of a gift or preſent,) but in the nature of a [a] Sacrifice, which was never lawful for any but [b] men, and thoſe [c] conſecrated.

[a] *Ut in nomen Virginis Collyridem quandam Sacrificarent.* Epiph. hær. 78. *Offerunt panem in nomen* Mariæ, *omnes autem pane participant* — [b] *Deo enim ab æterno nulla tenus mulier Sacrificavit.* Idem hæreſ. 79: [c] *Diaconiſſarum ordo eſt in Eccleſia, ſed non ad Sacrificandum, nam neque Diaconis concreditum eſt, ut aliquod myſterium perficiant.* Id. Ibid.

Secondly, for offering this [a] Sacrifice εἰς ὄνομα in the name of the Bleſſed Virgin, *i. e.* unto her, her ſelf directly and terminatively, as an act of [b] Divine Worſhip and ado-

[a] *vid. ſup. littera* (a)
[b] *Mortuis cultum divinum*

adoration, due unto her, as unto a Sovereign [c] Power and Deity.

*præſtantes.* Id. Ibid. *And again: Revera virgo erat honorata, ſed non ad adorationem nobis data ſed ipſa adorans Deum.* And again: *Non ut adoretur Virgo, nec ut Deum hanc efficeret,* &c. *Sit in honore* Maria; *Pater & Filius & Spiritus S. adoretur, Mariam nemo adoret. Deo debetur hoc myſterium* Id. Ibid. [c] *Pro Deo hanc introducere ſtatuerant.* Id. Ibid. *Revera Sanctum erat* Mariæ *corpus non tamen Deus.* And again. *Mulierem eam appellavit* Joh. 2. *Velut prophetans: & ne aliqui nimium admirati Sanctum, in hanc hæreſin dilabantur.* And again. *Non tamen aliter genita eſt præter hominis naturam, ſed ſicut omnes ex ſemine viri & utero Mulieris.* Id. Ibid.

*Reply.* It ſeems then theſe Women might offer this Cake to the honour and name of the Virgin *Mary*, if they had done it as a *Gift* or *Preſent* and not as a *Sacrifice.* *Epiphanius* then ſurely was too haſty to condemn them, being informed of nothing, but that they offered a Cake unto her. Methinks before he had put them in his Catalogue, he ſhould have enquired whether they offered this Cake as a *Gift* only, or as a *Sacrifice.* Certainly had the practice of offering to Saints by way of gifts, been the practice of the Church in his time, he would not have been ſo uncharitable, as to condemn that action as impious and Heretical, which might have received ſo lawful and pious a conſtruction. But he, good man, it ſeems could not conceive a difference between a Sacrifice, and the offering a Creature by way of Conſumption to the Honour of that to which it is offered. The ſubtle Wits of our times I hope have found out another definition for it, and I ſhall underſtand by you what it is. But if you can find no other, then certainly, though ſetting up a Picture or hanging up a Leg or Eye or Ear in memory of ſome miraculous cure, obtained by a Saints interceſſion, would be a *Gift* or *Preſent* only; yet offering of Incenſe, or burning a Taper in the honour of a Saint, daub the matter how you will, will be without Queſtion a *Sacrifice.* If you ſay, that there may be ſuch an offering and yet no Sacrifice; I would know then, how you would prove that the *Collyridians* offering was indeed a Sacrifice? All that *Epiphanius* ſays of them is but this —— *Panem proponunt & in Mariæ nomen offerunt.* And though this

this offering of theirs was indeed a Sacrifice in the notion of the word which I have given it, yet doth he not any where ſay expreſly, *That they did Sacrifice, or offer it as a Sacrifice,* but only and barely that they did *offer it* : not uſing (as good fortune would have it) any word which doth of neceſſity and properly ſignifie *to Sacrifice* : and therefore you are fain to help the Dice, and alter every place for your advantage. *Epiphanius* ſays not, as you tranſlate him, *ut in nomen Virginis Collyridem quendam Sacrificent*; nor *Sacrificantes offerunt*, as *Petavius* : but ὡς ἐπιτελεῖν, which may as well ſignifie, to *conſecrate* or *offer*, as to *Sacrifice*, if there be any difference between them. So the next place, *offerunt panem in nomen Mariæ, omnes autem pane participant*; proves not I hope offering by way of *Sacrifice*, unleſs the Conſumption of the oblation make it a *Sacrifice*; which if it do, how your Tapers can be kept from being Sacrifices I cannot imagine; unleſs again perhaps Conſumption by way of *Eating* will make it a *Sacrifice*, and by *Burning* will not; which cannot be, becauſe the whole Burnt-offerings were Sacrifices as well as any other.

Your third place is, *Deo autem ab æterno nullatenus mulier Sacrificavit*. But ἱερατεύω ſignifies not *to Sacrifice*, but only to *perform the Office of a Prieſt*, and ſo *Petavius* tranſlates the place. *Nunquam ſacerdotio functa eſt mulier*. And though Sacrificing be *one* perhaps, yet will you not ſay it is the *only* Office of a Prieſt: as your next and laſt place would have declared, had you ſet it down faithfully; but in that alſo you juggle again, and force it to ſpeak to your purpoſe thus. *Diaconiſſarum ordo eſt in Eccleſia, ſed non ad Sacrificandum* : but *Petavius* hath tranſlated it truly thus : *Quanquam vero Diaconiſſarum in Eccleſia ordo ſit, non tamen ad ſacerdotii functionem, aut ullam adminiſtrationem inſtitutus eſt*. And now though by an uſual Synechdoche the name of the *Genus* be given to the *Species*, and therefore had a man fairly and candidly tranſlated ἱερατεύω by *Sacrifico*, I ſhould not have much condemned him, yet to do it when the Queſtion is, whether this their offering, confeſſed to be an offering, were in propriety of ſpeech a Sa-

a Sacrifice, to do it for Ends, to ſhift off a convincing argument, to palliate over a foul matter, by putting a verbal difference where there is none indeed, and all that you may, *Imperitos rerum in fraudem illicere*; that is —— But I forbear you.

But Secondly it is pretended, [*they offered this Sacrifice* εἰς ὄνομα *in the name of the Bleſſed Virgin*: i. e. *unto her, her ſelf, directly and terminately as an act of Divine Worſhip and adoration due unto her, as unto a Sovereign Power and Deity.*] And to colour and countenance this ſtrange gloſs, many places are quoted out of *Epiphanius*, which I will examine in order as they lie.

The firſt place is, *mortuis cultum Divinum præſtantes*, where your meaning is, I believe, that *Epiphanius* ſays the *Collyridians* did ſo: but the truth is he ſays only, *mortuos colentes*; as *Petavius* tranſlates it: and therefore here once again you help the Dice; yet if he had ſaid ſo, why ſhould you rather from *cultum divinum* collect that, that they thought her *God*, than from *mortuis*, that they thought her *Dead*, and therefore certainly not a God? Certainly this can be no warrant to you, that *Epiphanius* charges them with ſo thinking: For *Proteſtants* you know impute to *Papiſts* that they give to Saints *cultum divinum*, and yet they do not impute to them the Hereſie of thinking, that the Saints are Sovereign Powers and Deities: But as S. *Paul* accuſeth the Gentiles, for that knowing God to be God, *they did not worſhip him as God*, ſo on the other ſide, *Proteſtants* condemn *Papiſts*, and *Epiphanius* for ought we can ſee hitherto, might condemn the *Collyridians*, for that knowing the Bleſſed Virgin not to be God, they yet worſhip'd her as God. That is, gave her that worſhip which is Gods own peculiar, which yet they might do, not becauſe they thought her God, but becauſe this worſhip, which was indeed proper to God, they might think not proper, but communicable to ſuch Creatures as were high in his favour.

The next place is —— *Revera virgo erat honorata, ſed non ad adorationem nobis data, ſed ipſa adorans Deum*, &c.

I anſwer that the *&c.* perhaps conceals ſomething more pertinent to your purpoſe, but in the Words ſet down there appears to me juſt nothing; for I can frame out of them no other Syllogiſm but this.

Whatſoever *Epiphanius* in this place ſays is not to be adored, that the *Collyridians* thought to be God.

But *Epiphan.* here ſays the Virgin is not to be adored.

*Ergo.* The *Collyridians* thought her God.

Of this Syllogiſm I deny the Major propoſition, and I believe ſhall ſtay as long for a proof of it, as I have done for an anſwer to ſome other diſcourſes, which being written in a few days, have waited now with a longing expectation for a promiſed anſwer many months. If you ſay, you would conclude from theſe Words, that they did adore her and therefore thought her God, I have anſwered already, that they might do this, not becauſe they thought her God, but becauſe they thought Creatures high in Gods favour capable of adoration.

The next place —— *Non ut adoretur Virgo, nec ut deum hanc efficeret* —— tells us that Chriſt took Fleſh of the Virgin, not that ſhe ſhould be adored, nor to make her God: And this you think imports, that they conceive her God. Yet if I ſhould, condemning your Practice of offering Tapers to her, uſe the ſame Words and ſay, —*Chriſt took Fleſh of the Virgin, not that ſhe ſhould be adored, or to make her God:* You would not yet conceive that I charged you with the Hereſie of believing her God, but only of the impiety of giving to her that worſhip which was peculiar to God: and why then might not *Epiphanius*, having like occaſion, uſe the ſame words to the *Collyridians* upon the ſame, and no other ground.

The next place —— *Mariam nemo adoret, Deo debetur hoc myſterium,* — is ſo far from proving your imagination, that it ſtrongly confirms my aſſertion, that *Epiphanius* did not impute to the *Collyridians* the opinion, *that the Virgin* Mary *was God.* If I ſhould ſay to a *Papiſt*, the Bleſſed Virgin is not to be worſhiped with the worſhip of *Hyperdaulia*, becauſe ſuch worſhip is due only to the Mother of God, would they not ſay I were mad and argued againſt my

my ſelf, for that they believed ſhe was the Mother of God. By like reaſon, if *Epiphanius* knew, that the *Collyridians* believed the Virgin *Mary* to be God, he reaſoned as wildly againſt himſelf in ſaying —— *Mariam nemo adoret, Deo debetur hoc myſterium* —— For it is very true (might they have ſaid) this ſervice is due to God alone, but you know our Belief and Profeſſion that ſhe is God, and therefore by your own rule capable of this worſhip.

The next place is —— *Pro Deo hanc introducere ſtuduerunt.* And may not this be juſtly ſaid to any man, who to any thing beſides God, gives that worſhip which is proper and peculiar unto God? What if to man that ſhould teach — · *The* Pope *had power to diſpenſe with men for the keeping of Gods Laws* —— I ſhould ſay, *pro Deo Papam introducis.* Muſt I of neceſſity mean that that man did verily believe the *Pope* not a man but a Sovereign Power and Deity? S. *Paul* tells us that *Covetouſneſs is Idolatry*; he tells us of ſome, *whoſe God is their Belly*; is it therefore conſequent, that every covetous man doth indeed believe his *Gold*, and every Glutton his *Belly*, to be indeed a Sovereign Power and Deity? Away with ſuch fopperies. Whoſoever loves, or fears, or truſts in any thing more than God, may yet be juſtly ſaid to make that his God, and whoſoever ſhould worſhip any Creature with that external worſhip which God has appropriated to himſelf, might juſtly be ſaid to bring in that Creature for God. S. *Paul* tells us of ſome, who *in words profeſſed God*, yet *factis negabant, in their deeds deny him*: ſo theſe on the contrary, may in their words deny this Creature to be God, and in their Hearts not think it ſo, yet ſeeing their actions to it are as if it were God, they may be juſtly charged, that with their deeds they make this Creature God.

*Qui fingit Sacros ex auro & marmore vultus,*
*Non facit ille Deos, qui colit ille facit.*

What if upon conſideration of the ſtrangely enormous worſhip which *Papiſts* give to the Virgin *Mary* (ſwearing by her name, making Vows unto her, offering Tapers to her Honour, attributing a kind of Communica-

ted omniſcience and almoſt omnipotence to her, as I can eaſily make good they do, partly out of the Offices of their Church, partly out of private mens Works, but ſet out with Licence and approbation) what I ſay, if upon this conſideration I ſhould affirm, *pro Deo ipſam introducere conantur.* Would it therefore be conſequent, that I muſt impute this Blaſphemy to them, that they believed and taught her to be a Sovereign Power and Deity? I trow not. And therefore *Epiphanius* might ſay the ſame of the *Collyridians* conſidering their *Action*, without any intent of imputing to them any ſuch *opinion.* This *Petavius* ſure ſaw well enough, and therefore (as I ſhall hereafter demonſtrate to the Eye) to countenance his Marginal Annotation, *Quidam Mariam Deum eſſe crediderunt*, he cunningly abuſes and perverts *Epiphanius* his Text with falſe Tranſlation. —— *Sic pugnat, Sic eſt metuendus Ulyſſes.* —— The next place is, *revera ſanctum erat* Mariæ *corpus non tamen Deus.* (*The Body of* Mary *was truly holy, but not a God.*) As much to the purpoſe as —*Tityre tu patulæ* —— for what if *Epiphanius* ſay, ſhe is not God, and therefore not to be adored, does it therefore follow that the *Collyridians* believed ſhe was a God? He that knows Logick or ſenſe, cannot but know, that he that will confute an Adverſaries concluſion, muſt chooſe ſuch principles to do it, to which his Adverſary conſents, and out of that which he grants prove that which he denies; or if his firſt propoſitions be not agreed to by his Adverſary, he muſt prove them in the end by ſuch as are agreed to; or elſe he does nothing. And therefore ſeeing *Epiphanius* thinks it ſufficient for the convincing of the *Collyridians*, of the unlawfulneſs of the practice, to ſay, ſhe was not God: it is evident, that ſo far was he from imputing to them the belief that ſhe was God, that he ſeems rather to take the contrary for a principle agreed upon between them, which it was ſufficient to ſay and ſuperfluous to prove. This anſwer I thought good to make, while I conceived that here *Epiphanius* had denied the Perſon of the Virgin *Mary* to be God; but after upon better conſideration I found that *Petavius* had abuſed me with adding to *Epi-*

*phanius*

*phanius* of his own —— *Illa fuit* —— and that *Epiphanius* ſays not here, *non tamen Deus* (*ſhe was not God*) of her *Perſon*, but of her *Body*; and as yet I do not underſtand that you impute to the *Collyridians* the belief, that her Body was God.

The next place —— *Mulierem eam appellavit*, &c. —— ſays no more but this; that our Saviour calls the Bleſſed Virgin *Woman*, that no man might think her any thing more than a Woman, as it were prophetically refuting the Schiſms and Hereſies which would be in the World: leſt ſome out of exceſs of admiration of her, might fall into the Dotage of this Hereſie. Thus far *Epiphanius*: but then the Queſtion will be, what was this Hereſie. You ſay the belief that ſhe was God. I ſay, not that ſhe was God, but that they might lawfully offer to her. And as I deny not but it follows, *ſhe is a Woman, therefore not a God*; ſo I think you will grant it follows as juſtly, *ſhe is a Woman, therefore not to be adored with offerings.* And therefore ſeeing the words lie indifferently between us, and are not expreſly and eſpecially here applied, for the refutation of that Hereſie which you pretend they were guilty of, I ſee no reaſon why *Epiphanius* might not as well intend them for that purpoſe which I conceive, as for that which you conceive.

The laſt place alledged tells us, *that ſhe was begotten and Born as other Men and Women are.* Which if the *Collyridians* had thought her God, Eternal and abſolutely without beginning, ſhould not have been barely ſaid but proved, as being in effect the very point in queſtion; and therefore ſeeing *Epiphanius* contents himſelf with ſaying ſo without proof, it is evident he never thought they would make difficulty to grant it, and conſequently that they did not believe her to be God Eternal.

But then again, if the Rule be good which part of your proofs depend upon, That whatever *Epiphanius* denies in this diſcourſe, that the *Collyridians* held (for upon that ground from —— *Non & Deum hanc efficeret: & non tamen Deus*, you conclude they believed her God) If I ſay this Rule be good, then you ſhould be conſtant to it, and

and now that he ſays, —— *Non tamen aliter genita eſt præter hominum naturam, (ſhe was not begotten in a different way from other men)* you ſhould infer, that they believed not that ſhe was God, but that ſhe was otherwiſe Born and Begotten than the ordinary ſort of Men. And ſo whereas he ſays before —— *Non tamen corpus de cœlo tulit* —— *(her Body was not from Heaven)* you ſhould infer, that they believed her Body came from Heaven. And again from thoſe —— *Sanctum erat Mariæ corpus non tamen Deus* —— you ſhould collect that they thought not only her perſon, but her Body to be God: or if theſe be wild and weak deductions, then you muſt acknowledge that I have done yours ſome favour in vouchſafing them a particular anſwer.

5. *Demand.* Whether in the Church of *Roman*, it be not an approved and perpetually practiſed worſhip of the Bleſſed Virgin, that Incenſe (which was never anciently offered unto any, either by *Jews* or *Gentiles*, but to the true, or to a ſuppoſed true God) and Tapers and divers other oblations, ſhould be offered to her honour?

*Anſw.* A practice of the Church of *Rome*, and approved too by thoſe that practiſe it, belongs not to her, except it be a practice of the Church and approved by her. What her practice is abroad I know not; here at home I ſee no ſuch practice; nor do I know any approbation of it, in any of her publick declarations: But this I know, that there is nothing in it unlawful or ſavouring of the *Collyridian Superſtition*, to offer Wax, Tapers or any other thing at the Memories of the Bleſſed Virgin or any other Canonized Saint, either as means to procure their interceſſion, by theſe outward Signs of the Honour and Devotion which they bear to them (as of Old we find by S. *Auſtin* [a] they did uſe to adorn their Tombs with Flowers) or as monuments of their thankfulneſs for ſome benefits received by their Interceſſion, as *Theodoret* [b] tells

[a] Ad *aquas Tibilotanas, Epiſcopo offerente Projecto, reliquias martyris glorioſiſſimi* Stephani, *ad ejus memoriam veniebat magnæ multitudinis concurſus & occurſus. Ibi cæca mulier, ut ad epiſcopum portantem pignora Sacra duceretur, oravit: Flores quos ferebat dedit; recepit, oculis admovit, protenus vidit.* Auguſt. de Civit. Dei. l. 22. c. 8. *abſcedens aliquid de Altari* (S. Stephani) *florum quod occurrit, tulit.* Idem. Ibid. *&c.* [b] *Theodoretus de curandis affec*: Græc. l. 8.

us

us of Eyes and Ears and Hands, ſome of Gold and ſome of Silver (hung up in the Chappels of the Saints) that had been preſented as oblations by thoſe that had recovered health in thoſe Members, according to their Vows made to that purpoſe in time of Sickneſs.

*Reply.* I do not deny, but a practice may be *tolerated* in a Church, and not *approved*. As the *Publick Stews* are in *Italy*, and *Uſury* in *England*: But it is one thing to Tolerate with condemnation, another to Tolerate without condemnation, nay with condemnation of thoſe that ſhould oppoſe or condemn it. And ſuch I doubt not upon examination, you may find is this practice, general in the Church of *Rome*, offering Tapers to the Saints and for their honour. I ſay, not only to God, at the Memories of the Saints, as you would mince the matter, which yet were a groundleſs ſuperſtition, (God having appointed no ſuch Sacrifice to be offered to him under the Goſpel) but to the Saints themſelves and to their honour, prove this lawful for either of thoſe purpoſes you mention, either to procure their interceſſion or as Monuments of thankfulneſs for benefits obtained by it, and then you ſhall do ſomething. Otherwiſe you will but trifle as now you have done: For inſtead of telling us what may be done *de jure*, you tell us what of Old has been done *de facto*. As if *ab antiquo*, and a *principio* were all one; or as if the Church (as we pretend) being ſubject to corruption, part of this corruption might not poſſibly have come in S. *Auſtins* or *Theodorets* time; yet this I ſay not, as if I would decline the Tryal of this cauſe by S. *Auſtin* or *Theodoret*; but becauſe I am ſure you will not be Tryed by the Fathers, no not the conſent of Fathers in all things: and therefore there is no reaſon nor equity in the World, that you ſhould ſerve your ſelves with their Authority in any thing.

But now what is it, which was done in S. *Auſtins* time, that may juſtifie the Practice of the *Roman* Church? was there then any approved offering of Wax, Tapers and Incenſe, to the Queen of Heaven or any other Saint? *nil horum*: you neither do nor can produce any thing out of S. *Auſtin* to this purpoſe. But what then is it? Why forſooth,

forſooth, they were uſed to adorn their Tombs: *Egregiam verò laudem & ſpolia ampla*; of Old in S. *Auſtins* time they were uſed to adorn their Tombs with Flowers, therefore we may offer Tapers to them. Truly an excellent *Enthymeme*, but I fear the concealed propoſition which ſhould make it a *Syllogiſm*, hides its head for ſhame and dares not appear: yet we will for once make bold to draw it forth into light, that you may look upon it and tell us how you like it. This therefore it is.

*Whoſe ſoever Tombs we adorn, to them and to their honour we may offer Wax Tapers.*

Conſider it I pray you, and if you approve it, then approve alſo of offering Tapers not only to Canonize Saints, but to all Chriſtians that may have Monuments in Churches. For all their Tombs may be adorned, with more pretious and laſting Ornaments than Flowers; yet if you had proved but this only, that in S. *Auſtins* time, they adorned the Saints Tombs with Flowers by theſe outward ſigns to procure their Interceſſion; this, though not much to the purpoſe, had been not abſolutely to delude us. But your quoted places prove not ſo much as this; and yet I believe you quoted the beſt you could find. Nay they prove not they did adorn their Tombs with Flowers at all, much leſs that they did it for your pretended purpoſe; ſuch fools you think to deal with, that will take any thing for any thing. Your firſt place, I ſay, proves it not, unleſs out of meer courteſie we underſtand by *ferebat, ſhe brought to adorn S.* Stephens *Tomb.*

The Second proves it not, unleſs we give you leave after *Altari* (without warrant from S. *Auſtin*) to put in, S. *Stephani*, whereas I am yet to ſeek for any place in S. *Auſtin*, where he calls any Altar, the Altar of ſuch or ſuch a Saint, which yet I think they forbore not for the unlawfulneſs, but for fear of miſconſtruction.

Then for *Theodoret*, he tells us indeed of Vows made, of monuments of thankfulneſs dedicated, for benefits obtained by the interceſſion of the Martyrs. But here alſo I fear your Conſcience tells you, that you abuſe us and hide your ſelf in ambiguities. For to whom does *Theodoret* ſay

ſay theſe Vows were made? to whom were theſe monuments of thankfulneſs dedicated? What, to the Author? or Procures of the received favours? To God, or to the Martyrs? If to the Martyrs, that had been ſomething towards, though not home to your purpoſe: For there is a a wide difference between offering of a Creature by way of Conſumption (as was never lawfully done but to God alone, as a profeſſion that he is the Lord of the Creature) and erecting a permanent Monument to a Saints honour; which I doubt not but it may lawfully be done to a living Saint, much more to the memory of a Martyr. But *Theodoret* in the place, hath not ſo much as this: Nay it is evident that theſe gifts he ſpeaks of, were both Vowed and payed to God himſelf. His words are —— *Piè precatos ea conſequi*, &c. —— that they which pray piouſly, obtain the things which they deſire, they paying of their Vowed preſents in the ſign of their recovered health, doth abundantly teſtifie. For their Lord accepts moſt gratiouſly theſe preſents how mean ſo ever.

6. *Demand.* Whether according to the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, this may not be done lawfully by Women and Children, and men that are not Prieſts?

*Anſw.* They may offer any thing by way of *gifts* and *preſents*, by the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church; But it is contrary to the *Roman* Doctrine, for any other than Prieſts, to offer any thing by way of *Sacrifice*, as the *Collyridians* did.

*Reply. Ariſtotle* ſays moſt truly, that true Definitions (he means I think of the terms of the concluſion to be demonſtrated) are the beſt principles of Science: and therefore want of them, muſt needs be a cauſe of Error and confuſion in any diſcourſe. Let me therefore here requeſt you to ſet down what is a *Sacrifice*, and how diſtinguiſhed from an oblation by way of *gift* or *preſent*, and you will quickly ſee, that if the *Collyridians* offering a Cake to the Bleſſed Virgin were indeed a *Sacrifice*, your offering a Taper to her, muſt likewiſe be ſo. For a *Sacrifice* is nothing elſe (for ought I know) but the oblation of any Creature by way of *Conſumption*, to the honour

of that, whatſoever it is, to which it is offered. For if you include in the definition, that this offering muſt be intended to the higheſt Lord of all: So is, as you pretend, your offering of Tapers to the Bleſſed Virgin, intended to God finally, though not immediately. If you ſay it muſt be directed immediatly to him; and is, not only *no lawful Sacrifice*, but ſimply *no Sacrifice* unleſs it be ſo: I ſay you may as well require to the eſſence of a Sacrifice, that it be offered by a Prieſt, and from thence conclude, becauſe the *Collyridians* were, you ſay, no Prieſts, their offering was no Sacrifice. For the object of the Action is as extrinſecal to the eſſence of it, as the efficient; And therefore if the defect of a due and legitimate Offerer, cannot hinder but that an offering may be a true Sacrifice, neither will the want of a due and lawful object be any hindrance but ſtill it may be ſo. Secondly, I ſay, this is to confound the eſſence of things with the lawful uſe of them; in effect as if you ſhould ſay, that a Knife, if miſimployed, were a Knife no longer. Thirdly, it is to make it not unlawful, to offer Incenſe (which yet you ſeem ſomewhat ſcrupulous of) or Burnt-offerings to the Virgin *Mary*, or the Saints, or even to living Men, provided you know and believe and profeſs them to be Men and not Gods. For this once ſuppoſed, theſe offerings will be no longer Sacrifices, and to offer to Creatures offerings that are not Sacrifices, you ſay, by the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church is lawful: It is laſtly, to deny (which is moſt ridiculous) that the *Pagans* did indeed Sacrifice to any of their inferiour Gods.

7. *Demand.* If it be ſaid, that this worſhip which they give to the Bleſſed Virgin is not that of *Latria*, but that of *Dulia* or *Hyperdulia*, for that they do not eſteem her God: or if it be ſaid, that their worſhip to her is not finally terminated neither, but given her for her relation to Chriſt. I demand, whether as it is, in S. *Pauls* judgment, a great crime for him that knows God, not to worſhip him as God, ſo it be not as great a crime, for him that knows her not to be God, yet to worſhip her (as if ſhe were God) with the worſhip which is proper and

and hath been alwaies appropriated to God alone, ſuch is the *worſhip of oblations?*

*Anſw.* The *worſhip of oblations*, as *worſhip* is taken largly for *honour*, and *oblations* for a *gift* or *preſent*, was never appropriate to God alone; take *worſhip* and *oblations* in any higher ſenſe, and ſo it is not allowed in the Church of *Rome.*

*Reply.* The *oblation* of things by way of *Conſumption*, is the worſhip I ſpoke of; this is a higher matter, than that of *gifts* and *preſents*, and this is allowed in the Church of *Rome*, to be imployed on, and directed into, (though not terminated in) the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints.

8. *Demand.* Whether any thing can be ſaid for the juſtifying the Doctrine and practice of the *Roman* Church in this matter, which might not alſo have been as juſtly pretended, for the juſtification of the *Collyridians* in their opinion and practice; ſeeing it was never imputed to them, that they accounted the Bleſſed Virgin God, or that they believed in more Gods than one. And ſeeing their chooſing her out, rather than any other Woman or any other Creature for the object of their Devotion, ſhews plainly, that they gave it her for her Relation to Chriſt?

*Anſw.* The *Collyridians* could not ſay this, as appears by what has been ſaid before: As it is a moſt ſhameleſs ſlander upon Gods Church, and ſuch as (without repentance) will lie heavy upon his Soul that uttered it, that the *Collyridians* might as juſtly and truly have ſaid all this for themſelves as *Papiſts* for themſelves.

*Reply.* To this I reply four things. 1. That to my laſt and moſt convincing reaſon, you have anſwered (as much as you could I believe, but yet you have anſwered) nothing; and I am well content you ſhould do ſo; for where nothing is to be had, the King himſelf muſt loſe his right. 2. That if I had thought or ſpoke better of the *Collyridians* than they deſerved, yet I cannot ſee how this had been to ſlander the Church of *Rome.* 3. That I did not poſitively affirm, that the *Collyridians* might do ſo, but deſired only it might be inquired into and examined,

whether for the reaſons alledged they might not do ſo. 4. And laſtly, upon a thorow examination of the matter, I do now affirm, what before I did not, that the *Collyridians* for ought appears to the contrary, might juſtly and truly have ſaid for the juſtification of their practice, as much, nay the very ſame things that the *Papiſts* do for theirs. For they might have ſaid, we are Chriſtians and believe the Scripture, and believe there is but one God. We offer not to the Bleſſed Virgin, as believing ſhe is God, but the Mother of God: our worſhip of her is not abſolute but relative, not terminated in her, but given to her for her Sons ſake: And if our practice may be allowed, we are content to call our Oblation, not a Sacrifice, but a preſent: neither is there any reaſon, why it ſhould be called a Sacrifice, more than the Offering and Burning a Taper to the honour of the ſame Virgin. All this the *Collyridians* might have ſaid for themſelves: and therefore I believe, you will have more cauſe to repent you for daubing over impiety with untempered Morter, than I ſhall have for ſlandering the *Roman* Church with a matter of truth.

9. *Demand.* Whether therefore, one of the two muſt not of neceſſity follow: that either the Ancient Church Erred in condemning the Opinion and Practice of the *Collyridians* as Heretical, or elſe that the Church of *Rome* Errs, in approving the ſame opinion, and the ſame practice in effect, which in them was condemned. That is, whether the Church of *Rome* muſt not be Heretical with the *Collyridians*, or elſe the *Collyridians* Catholicks with the Church of *Rome*?

*Anſw.* It appears by the former anſwers, that neither did the Ancient Church Err, in condemning the opinion and practice of the *Collyridians*, as Heretical, nor doth the Church of *Rome* approve the ſame opinion or the ſame practice.

*Reply.* The Subſtance of the former anſwers is but this. That the *Papiſts* offer to the Virgin *Mary* and other Saints Wax Tapers by way of *gift* or *preſent*, not of Sacrifice; and to her not as to a God, but as the Mother of God:

God: but that the *Collyridians* offered to her by way of Sacrifice, as to a Sovereign Power and Deity. To this I have replied and proved, that it no way appears, that the *Collyridians* did believe the Bleſſed Virgin to be a Sovereign Power and Deity, or that ſhe was not ſubordinate to God. Then that their offering might be called a *gift*, as well as the *Papiſts*, and the *Papiſts* a *Sacrifice* as well as theirs; both of them being a *Conſumption* of a Creature in honour of the Bleſſed Virgin, and neither of them more than ſo: and therefore either the *Collyridians* muſt ſtand with the Church of *Rome*, or the Church of *Rome* fall with the *Collyridians*. It had been perhaps ſufficient for me, thus to have vindicated my Aſſertion from contrary objections, without taking on my ſelf the burden of proving a Negative: yet to free from all doubt the conformity of the *Roman* Church with the *Collyridians*, in this point, I think it will be neceſſary to ſhew, and that by many very probable Arguments, that *Epiphanius* did not impute to them the pretended Hereſie of *believing* the Virgin *Mary God:* for then that other Evaſion, that their oblation is a Sacrifice and the *Papiſts* is not, together with this pretence will of it ſelf fall to the ground.

Now an opinion may be imputed to a man two ways: either becauſe he holds and maintains it expreſly and formally and in terms: or becauſe it may by a rational deduction be collected from ſome other opinion which he does hold: In this latter ſenſe I deny not but *Epiphanius* might impute this opinion we ſpeak of to the *Collyridians*, as a conſequence upon their practice, which practice they eſteemed lawful. But that they held it and owned it formally and in terms, this I ſay *Epiphanius* does not impute to them, which I think for theſe ſeven reaſons.

My firſt Reaſon is, becauſe he could not juſtly do ſo, and therefore without evident proof we may not ſay he did ſo: for this were to be uncharitable to him, in making him uncharitable to others. Now I ſay he could not juſtly charge them with this opinion, becauſe he was not informed of any ſuch opinion that they held, but only of their

their practice, and this practice was no ſufficient proof that they held this opinion. That his information reached no further than their Practice, appears out of his own Words. *I have heard* (ſaith he. Hæreſ. 78.) *another thing with great aſtoniſhment : that ſome being madly affected to the Bleſſed Virgin, endeavour to bring her in in Gods place, being mad and beſides themſelves : For they report that certain Women in* Arabia *have deviſed this Vanity, to have meetings, and offer a Cake to the Bleſſed Virgin :* The ſame practice he ſets down *Hæreſ.* 79. But that he was informed of any ſuch opinion that they held, he has not a Word or Syllable to any ſuch purpoſe ; and yet if he had been informed of any, here had been the place to ſet it down : which certainly writing his Book rather of Heretical opinions than practices, he would not have omitted to do ; if there had been occaſion : his ſilence therefore is a ſufficient Argument, that he was not informed of any ſuch opinion that they held.

Now that their practice was no aſſurance that they held this opinion, it is manifeſt ; becauſe they might ground it not upon this opinion *that ſhe was God*, but upon another as falſe, though not altogether ſo impious, *That the Worſhip of Oblations was not proper to God alone.* And therefore, though *Epiphanius* might think or fear that poſſibly they might ground their practice upon that other impious opinion, and therefore out of abundant caution confute that alſo, as he doth obliquely and in a word, and once only in all his long diſcourſe, by telling them that our Saviour called her *Woman* ; yet he had no ground from their practice to aſſure himſelf, that certainly they did hold ſo. Nay Juſtice and Reaſon and Charity would, that he ſhould incline himſelf to believe, that they grounded their practice upon that other opinion, which had leſs impiety in it, that is, that this worſhip of Oblations, was not proper to God, but communicable to Creatures high in his favour.

My ſecond is, Becauſe if *Epiphanius* had known, that theſe *Collyridians* held the Bleſſed Virgin to be a Supream Power and Deity ; this being a far greater matter than offering

offering a Cake to her, ſhould in all probability rather have given them their denomination: at leaſt when he ſets down what their Hereſie was, he would have made this part of it, that they did believe ſo: But to the contrary, in his *Anacæphaleoſis*, p. 130. he thus deſcribes them. *They that offer to the name of the Bleſſed Virgin Cakes, who are called* Collyridians. And again, p. 150. *They that offer to the Bleſſed Virgin Cakes who are called* Collyridians: So to the 79th. Hereſie he gives this Title, *Againſt the* Collyridians *who offer to* Mary: So *Hæreſ.* 78, and 79. He ſets down what he heard of them; but no where that they held this opinion of her: I conclude therefore, that he never conceived this opinion to be a part of their Hereſie, and they were no further chargeable with it, than as a probable conſequent upon their practice.

My third is, Becauſe had the *Collyridians* held her God, they would have worſhiped her all the year long, and not only once a year at a Solemn-time, as *Epiphanius* ſays they did.

My fourth is, Becauſe if *Epiphanius* had known that they held her God, he would queſtionleſs have urged them with thoſe Attributes that are given to God in Scripture, as Eternity, Immortallity, Impoſſibility, Omnipotence, *&c.* And ſhewed them, that if they believed the Scripture, they could not think of her any of thoſe things; if they did not, they had no reaſon to think of her any thing more than of an ordinary Woman.

My fifth is, becauſe had their opinion been, that the Bleſſed Virgin was God; a great part of *Epiphanius*'s diſcourſe were plainly ridiculous; both where he ſays only without proof, ſhe was not a God but a Mortal Creature, which to them that held the contrary ſhould not have been ſaid, but proved: But eſpecially where he ſpeaks to this purpoſe (as he does very frequently) that the honour of Oblations was not to be given to Angels or Men, much leſs to Women, but only to God: for what had that been to the *Collyridians*, if they thought her (as is pretended) a Sovereign Power and Deity? to what purpoſe was it for *Epiphanius* to ask, *Quis prophetam*; *What prophet*

*prophet ever permitted, that a Man, much leſs a Woman ſhould be adored, though he be yet alive. Nor* John *nor* Tecla, *nor any other Saint. For neither ſhall the Old Superſtition have dominion over us, that leaving the Living God, we ſhould Adore his Creatures.* To what end I ſay was all this, if they thought her not a Saint nor Creature, but God himſelf and the Lord of all? How did this Argument touch them? *Ne Angelos quidem —— He ſuffers not the very Angels to be adored, how much leſs the Daughter of* Anna? if they thought her not the Daughter of *Anna*, but God Eternal; In vain had it been to ſay to them — *Not to a Woman, no nor to a Man, but to God alone, is this miſtery* (of Oblation) *due.* So that the Angels themſelves are not fit Subjects for ſuch an honour. Or again, *Let the Creature be turned to the Creator: Let ſhame at length compel you to worſhip God alone:* Or laſtly, that ſo often repeated —— *Let* Mary *be honoured, but the Lord only adored.* For they might have anſwered all this in a word, ſaying, All this diſcourſe ſits beſides the Cuſhion, and concerns us and our offering nothing at all. For we believe the Bleſſed Virgin to whom we offer neither Man nor Woman, nor Angel, nor Creature, but a Deity.

A Sixth Reaſon let it be this, If *Epiphanius* did indeed ſay of the *Collyridians* as is pretended, That they held the Virgin *Mary* God, and ſo difference their practice from the *Papiſts*: Then the Author of this Anſwer and *Petavius* in his Tranſlation, needed not to have dictated to him what he ſhould ſay, nor make him ſay ſo whether he will or no: But it is evident they do ſo, as of the Author of this Anſwer I have already ſhewn: and for *Petavius* his part, I will ſo preſent it to your view, that if you will not ſhut your Eyes, you ſhall not chooſe but ſee it.

Firſt then, *Hæreſ.* 78. *propè fin.* he (*Petavius*) ſets in his Margent, *quidam Deum Mariam eſſe, crediderunt*; and to countenance this with a *loquuntur* of his own putting in, makes them *ſpeak* of her like mad Men, *i. e.* they ſaid ſhe was God: whereas in *Epiphanius*'s Greek they ſay juſt nothing.

Secondly,

Secondly, To faſten the pretended Opinion on them, he tranſlates καινοφώνημα *Novum dogma:* preſuming it ſeems καινοφώνημα would eaſily be miſtaken for κενοφώνημα, and therefore meanes nothing by it, but a vanity or folly.

Thirdly, He tranſlates τοῦτο, *Illud*; and ſo makes it look backward to that pretended *Novum dogma* of the *Collyridians*; whereas it ſignifies there [And] and looks forward to their practice.

Fourthly, With the help of a *Colon*, he ſtops the ſenſe at *Commentas fuiſſe*, whereas in *Epiphanius* there is but a *Comma*, and the ſenſe goes on without ſuſpenſion.

Fifthly, With an *adeo ut*, he brings in their action, as an effect of their former opinion; whereas *Epiphanius* lays nothing to their charge but their Action only: So that whereas *Epiphanius* his words truly tranſlated run thus: *Another thing I have received with great aſtoniſhment, that others being mad concerning the Bleſſed Virgin, have and do go about to bring her in, in the place of God, being mad, I ſay, and beſides themſelves: For they report that certain Women in* Arabia *have brought this vanity of offering a Cake to her name. Petavius* makes them thus —— *Not without admiration we have heard another thing, that ſome in theſe things that concern the moſt holy Virgin have proceeded to that degree of madneſs, that they would obtrude her upon us for a God, and ſpeak of her as madmen: For they report that certain Women in* Arabia, *have invented that new Opinion: ſo that to the Virgins name and honour, they offer by way of ſacrifice a Cake or wreath of Bread.*

Again in the ſame *Hæreſ.* ἱερουργῖν διὰ γυναικῶν, he tranſlates advantageouſly —— *per mulieres ſacrificia facere.* Whereas ἱερουργῖν is more general than *ſacrificia facere*, and ſignifies *ſacris operari*, or *ſacros ritus peragere.*

Again, in the ſame place, whereas *Epiphanius* ſays ſimply and abſolutely —— *Let no man offer to her name*, he makes it, *Let no man offer ſacrifice to her name*; as if you might lawfully offer any thing provided you do not call it a ſacrifice.

So again *Hæreſ.*79. beſides his putting cunningly——*ipſa fuit*—— which before we took notice of; he makes no ſcruple to put in *Dogma* and *Sacrificium*, whereſoever it may be for his purpoſe. *Epiphanius* his title to this Hereſie is, *Againſt the* Collyridians *who offer to* Mary——*Petavius* puts in——*Sacrifice.*

Again in the ſame page, before *D.* he puts in his own *illo dogmate*, and whereas *Epiphanius* ſays–*in all this*, he makes it, *in all this Opinion.*

Pag. 1061. τὸ θηλυϛὴς ὑπογοιᾶς, he tranſlates, *this womaniſh Opinion*, whereas ὑπόγοια though perhaps it may ſignifie a *thought*, or act of thinking, yet I believe it never ſignifies an *Opinion* which we hold.

Ibid. at *B.* τοῦτο——this——he renders *this Opinion.*

Pag. 1064. at *C. Nor that we ſhould offer to her name*, ſimply and abſolutely: he makes it,——*Nor that we ſhould offer ſacrifice to her name.* So many times is he fain to corrupt, and tranſlate him partially, leſt in condemning the *Collyridians*, he might ſeem to have involved the practice of the *Roman Church* in the ſame Condemnation.

My Seventh and laſt Reaſon is this. Had *Epiphanius* known that the *Collyridians* held the *Virgin Mary* to be a Sovereign power and Deity, then he could not have doubted, whether this their offering was to her or to God for her: whereof yet he ſeems doubtful and not fully reſolved, as his own words intimate, *Hæreſ.*79. *ad fin. Quam multa* &c. *How many things may be objected againſt this Hereſie? for idle Women either worſhipping the Bleſſed Virgin, offer unto her a Cake, or elſe they take upon them to offer for her this foreſaid ridiculous oblation. Now both are fooliſh and from the Devil.*

Theſe Arguments I ſuppoſe do abundantly demonſtrate to any man not viel'd with prejudice, that *Epiphanius* imputed not to the *Collyridians* the Hereſie of believing the Virgin *Mary* God: and if they did not think her God, there is then no reaſon imaginable why their oblation of a *Cake*, ſhould not be thought a *Preſent*, as well as the Papiſts

Papiſts offering a *Taper*, or that the Papiſts offering a *Taper*, ſhould not be thought a *Sacrifice*, as well as their offering a *Cake*; and ſeeing this was the difference pretended between them, this being vaniſhed there remains none at all; So that my firſt Concluſion ſtands yet firm; that either the Ancient Church erred in condemning the *Collyridians*, or the preſent errs in approving and practiſing the ſame worſhip.

---

## An Advertisement.

The Reader when he meets with the Phraſe *Catholick Doctrin*, in the two following Diſcourſes, muſt remember, that it does not ſignifie *Articles of Faith* determined in any General Councils, which might be looked upon as the Faith of the whole Church; but the *Current* and *Common Opinion* of the Age, which obtained in it without any known oppoſition and contradiction. Neither need this be wondred at, ſince they are about matters far removed from the Common Faith of Chriſtians, and having no neceſſary influence upon good life and manners, whatſoever neceſſity, by miſtake of ſome Scriptures, might be put upon them.

---

## IV. *An Argument drawn from the admitting Infants to the Euchariſt, as without which they could not be ſaved, againſt the Churches Infallibility.*

THE Condition without the performance whereof no man can be admitted to the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, is this; that he believe firmly and without doubting, whatſoever the Church requires him to believe: More diſtinctly and particularly thus:

He muſt believe all that to be divine Revelation which that Church teaches to be ſuch; as the Doctrin of the Trinity, the Hypoſtatical union of two natures in the perſon of Chriſt. The proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son: the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, and ſuch like.

Whatſoever that Church teaches to be neceſſary, he muſt believe to be neceſſary. As Baptiſm for Infants; Faith in Chriſt, for thoſe that are Capable of Faith; Penance for thoſe that have committed mortal ſin after Baptiſm, &c.

Whatſoever that Church declares expedient and profitable, he muſt believe to be expedient and profitable: as Monaſtical Life: Prayer to Saints: Prayer for the Dead: going on Pilgrimages: The uſe of Pardons: Veneration of holy Images and Reliques: Latin Service where the people underſtand it not: Communicating the Laity in one kind and ſuch like.

Whatſoever that Church holdeth lawful, he muſt believe lawful: As to Marry: to make diſtinction of Meats, as if ſome were clean and others unclean: to flie in time of Perſecution: for them that ſerve at the Altar, to live by the Altar: to teſtifie a truth by Oath, when a lawful Magiſtrate ſhall require it: to poſſeſs Riches, &c.

Now is it impoſſible that any man ſhould certainly believe any thing; unleſs either it be evident of it ſelf, or he have ſome certain reaſon (at leaſt ſome ſuppoſed certain reaſon) and infallible ground for his belief. Now the Doctrins

Doctrins which the Church of *Rome* teacheth, it is evident and undeniable that they are not evident of themſelves, neither evidently true nor evidently credible. He therefore that will believe them, muſt of neceſſity have ſome certain and infallible ground whereon to build his belief of them.

There is no other ground for a Mans belief of them, eſpecially in many points, but only an aſſurance of the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*. No man can be aſſured that that Church is infallible and cannot err, whereof he may be aſſured that ſhe hath erred, unleſs ſhe had ſome new promiſe of divine aſſiſtance, which might for the future ſecure her from danger of erring; but the Church of *Rome* pretends to none ſuch.

Nothing is more certain, than that that Church hath erred, which hath believed and taught irreconcileable Contradictions, one whereof muſt of neceſſity be an Error.

That the Receiving the Sacrament of the Euchariſt is neceſſary for Infants, and that the receiving thereof is not neceſſary for them: That it is the will of God, that the Church ſhould adminiſter the Sacrament to them; and that it is not the will of God that the Church ſhould do ſo; are manifeſt and irreconcileable Contradictions: Suppoſing only, (that which is moſt evident) that the Euchariſt is the ſame thing, of the ſame vertue and efficacy now, as it was in the primitive Church: That Infants are the ſame things they were, have as much need, are capable of as much benefit by the Euchariſt, now as then: As ſubject to irreverent carriages, then as now. And laſtly, that the preſent Church is as much bound to provide for the ſpiritual good of Infants, as the Ancient Church was: I ſay theſe things ſuppoſed, the propoſitions before ſet down are plain and irreconcileable Contradictions: whereof the preſent *Roman* Church doth hold the Negative, and the Ancient Church of *Rome* did hold the Affirmative; and therefore it is evident, that either the preſent Church doth err, in holding ſomething not neceſſary, which is ſo; or that the Ancient Church did err, in holding ſomething neceſſary, which was not ſo.

For

For the Negative Propoſition, *viz. That the Euchariſt is not neceſſary for Infants*; that it is the Doctrin of the preſent Church of *Rome* it is moſt manifeſt. 1. From the diſuſe and abolition and prohibition of the contrary Ancient practice. For if the Church did conceive it neceſſary for them, either ſimply for their ſalvation, or elſe for their increaſe or confirmation in grace, and advancement to a higher degree of glory (unleſs ſhe could ſupply ſome other way their damage in this thing, which evidently ſhe cannot) what an uncharitable ſacriledge is it, to debar and defraud them of the neceſſary means of their ſo great ſpiritual benefit? eſpecially ſeeing the adminiſtration of it might be ſo ordered, that irreverent caſualties might eaſily be prevented: which yet ſhould they fall out againſt the Churches and Paſtors intention, certainly could not offend God, and in reaſon ſhould not offend man. Or if the Church do believe, that upon ſuch a vain fear of irreverence (which we ſee moved not the Ancient Church at all) ſhe may lawfully forbid ſuch a general, perpetual and neceſſary charity, certainly herein ſhe commits a far greater error than the former. Secondly, from the Council of *Trents* Anathema, denounced on all that hold the contrary, in theſe words. *If any man ſay that the receiving of the Euchariſt, is neceſſary for little children, before they come to years of diſcretion, let him be Anathema.* Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 21. *de communione parvulorum*, Can. 4.

Now for the Affirmative part of the Contradiction, to make it evident that that was the Doctrin of the Ancient Church; I will prove it, Firſt, from the general practice of the Ancient Church for ſeveral Ages. Secondly, by the direct and formal Teſtimonies of the Fathers of thoſe times. Thirdly, by the confeſſion of the moſt learned Antiquaries of the *Roman* Church. My Firſt Argument I form thus. If to communicate Infants was the general practice of the Ancient Church for many Ages; then certainly the Church then believed, that the Euchariſt was neceſſary for them, and very available for their Spiritual benefit: But it is certain, that the Communicating of Infants was the general practice of the Church for many

Ages

Ages: Therefore the Church of thoſe times thought it neceſſary for them. To deny the conſequence of the propoſition, is to charge the Church with extream folly, wilful ſuperſtition, and perpetual profanation of the Bleſſed Sacrament. As for the Aſſumption, it is fully confirmed by *Clemens Rom. Conſtit. Apoſt.* l. 3. c. 20. *Dionyſius Areopagita de Eccleſ. Hierarch.* cap. ult. S. *Cyprian* and a Council of *African* Biſhops with him, *Epiſt.* 59. *ad Fidum*; and in his Treatiſe *de Lapſis* p. 137. Edit. *Pamel. Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola* in *Italy*, An. 353. in *Epiſt.* 12. *ad Senem*; out of *Ordo Romanus*, cited by *Alevinus* S. *Bedes* Scholar and Maſter to *Charlemain* in his Book *de divinis officiis cap. de Sab. Sancto Paſc. Gennadius Maſſilienſis de Eccleſ. dogmatibus* c. 52. *Concil. Toletanum* 2. Can. 11. It continued in the Weſtern Church, unto the days of *Lewes* the *Debonair*, witneſs *Cardinal Perron des paſſages de S. Auſtin* p. 100. Some footſteps of it remained there in the time of *Hugo de S. Victore*, as you may ſee *lib.* 1. *de Sacram. & Cærem.* cap. 20. It was the practice of the Church of the *Armenians* in *Waldenſis* his time, as he relates out of *Guido* the *Carmelite*, Tom. 2. de *Sacr.* c. 91. *de erroribus Armenorum.* It is ſtill in force in the Church of the *Abyſſines*, witneſs *Franc. Alvarez. Hiſt. Æthiop.* c. 22. *& Thomas a Jeſu de procuranda ſalute omnium gentium.* It has cotinued without any interruption in the *Greek* Church, unto this preſent Age, as may be evidently gathered out of *Lyranus* in c. 6. *John.* *Arcudius* lib. 1. c. 14. & lib. 3. c. 40. *de concord. Eccleſ. Orient. & Occident. in Sacram. adminiſtratione*; *Card. Perron des paſſages de S. Auſtin.* p. 100. where he alſo aſſures us of the Primitive Church in general, that ſhe gave Infants the Euchariſt as ſoon as they were baptized: and that the cuſtome of giving this Sacrament to little Infants the Church then obſerved: and before p. 21. That in thoſe Ages it was always given to Infants together with Baptiſm. The ſame is likewiſe acknowledged by *Contzen* in *John* 6. *ver.* 54. and by *Thomas a Jeſu de proc. ſalute omnium gentium.* So that this matter of the practice of the Ancient Church is ſufficiently cleared. Seeing therefore the Ancient Church did uſe this Cuſtom, and could have no other ground for it,

but

but their belief that this Sacrament was neceſſary for Infants, it follows neceſſarily, that the Church then did believe it neceſſary.

But deductions, though never ſo evident, are ſuperfluous and may be ſet aſide, where there is ſuch abundance of direct and formal Authentical Teſtimonies; whereof ſome ſpeak in *Theſi*, of the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for all men, others in *Hypotheſi*, of the neceſſity of it for Infants.

My Second Argument, from the Teſtimonies of the Fathers of thoſe times I form thus. That Doctrin, in the affirmative whereof the moſt eminent Fathers of the ancient Church agree, and which none of their contemporaries have oppoſed or condemned, ought to be taken for the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of thoſe times.

But the moſt eminent Fathers of the Ancient Church agree in the Affirmation of this Doctrin, that the Euchariſt is neceſſary for Infants; and none of their contemporaries have oppoſed or condemned it. *Ergo*, it ought to be taken for the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of their times. The Major of this Syllogiſm is delivered and fully proved by *Card. Perron*, in his Letter to *Caſaubon* 5. obſ. and is indeed ſo reaſonable a poſtulate, that none but a contentious ſpirit can reject it.

For confirmation of the Minor, I will alledge, firſt, their ſentences, which in Theſi affirm the Euchariſt to be generally neceſſary for all, and therefore for Infants: and then their Suffrages, who in Hypotheſi avouch the neceſſity of it for Infants.

The moſt pregnant Teſtimonies of the firſt rank are theſe: Of *Irænens* lib. 4. *cont. Hereſ.* c. 34. where he makes our Union to Chriſt by the Euchariſt, the foundation of the hope of our reſurrection, in theſe words. *As the bread of Earth, after the Invocation of God, is now not common bread, but the Euchariſt, conſiſting of two things an earthly and an heavenly: ſo our bodies receiving the Euchariſt, are not now corruptible (for ever) but have hope of reſurrection.* The like he hath, *lib.* 5. *c.* 2. And hence in probability it is, that the *Nicene Council* ſtiled this Sacrament, *Symbolum reſurrectionis*,

*ſurrectionis*, the pledge of our Reſurrection. And *Ignatius* Ep. ad Eph. *Pharmacum Immortalitatis*, the Medicine of Immortality.

*Cyril. Alex.* lib. 4. in Joan. *They ſhall never partake, nor ſo much as taſt, the life of holineſs and happineſs, which receive not the Son in the myſtical Benediction. Cyril.* lib. 10. in Joan. c. 13. & lib. 11. c. 27. *This corruptible nature of our body, could not otherwiſe be brought to life and immortality, unleſs this body of natural life were conjoyned unto it.* The very ſame things ſaith *Gregory Nyſſen.* Orat. Catech. c. 37. And that they both ſpeak of our conjunction with Chriſt by the Euchariſt, the Antecedents and Conſequents do fully manifeſt, and it is a thing confeſſed by learned Catholicks.

*Cyprian de cœna Domini*, and *Tertullian de reſur. carnis*, ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe: But I have not their Books by me, and therefore cannot ſet down their words. S. *Chryſoſtom*, Hom. 47. in Joh. on theſe words, *niſi manducaveritis*, has many pregnant and plain ſpeeches to our purpoſe. *As, the words here ſpoken are very terrible: verily, ſaith he, if a man eat not my fleſh, and drink not my blood, he hath no life in him; for whereas they ſaid before, this could not be done, he ſhews it not only not impoſſible, but alſo very neceſſary.* And a little after; *he often iterates his ſpeech concerning the holy myſteries, ſhewing the neceſſity of the thing, and that by all means it muſt be done.* And again, *what means that which he ſays, my fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed; either that this is the true meat that ſaves the ſoul; or to confirm them in the faith of what he had ſpoken, that they ſhould not think he ſpoke Enigmatically, or parabolically, but knew that by all means they muſt eat his body.*

But moſt clear and unanſwerable is that place *lib.* 3. *de Sacerdotio*, where he ſaith, *If a man cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven unleſs he be born again of water and the holy ſpirit; and if he which eats not the fleſh of our Lord and drinks not his blood, is caſt out of eternal life: And all theſe things cannot be done by any other, but only by thoſe holy hands, the hands, I ſay of the Prieſt, how then without their help can any man, either avoid the fire of hell, or obtain the Crowns laid up for us.*

*Theophylact.* in 6. Joan. *when therefore we hear, that unleſs we eat the fleſh of the Son of man, we cannot have life, we muſt have faith without doubting in the receiving of the divine myſteries, and never inquire how: for the natural man, that is he which followeth humane, that is, natural reaſons, receives not the things which are above nature and ſpiritual; as alſo he underſtands not the ſpiritual meat of the fleſh of our Lord, which they that receive not, ſhall not be partakers of eternal life, as not receiving Jeſus, who is the true life.* S. *Auſtin* de pec. mer. & Remiſ. c. 24. *Very well do the puny Chriſtians call Baptiſm nothing elſe but ſalvation; and the Sacrament of Chriſts Body nothing elſe but Life; from whence ſhould this be, but as I believe from the Ancient and Apoſtolical Tradition, by which this Doctrin is implanted into the Churches of Chriſt, that but by Baptiſm and the participation of the Lords Table, not any man can attain, neither to the Kingdom of God, nor to ſalvation and eternal life.*

Now we are taught by the learned Cardinal; that when the Fathers ſpeak, not as Doctors, but as witneſſes of the Cuſtoms of the Church of their times; and do not ſay, *I believe this ſhould be ſo holden, or ſo underſtood, or ſo obſerved, but that the Church from one end of the earth to the other believes it ſo, or obſerves it ſo*; then we no longer hold what they ſay, for a thing ſaid by them, but as a thing ſaid by the whole Church; and principally when it is in points, whereof they could not be ignorant, either becauſe of the condition of the things, as in matters of fact; or becauſe of the ſufficiency of the perſons: and in this caſe, we argue no more upon their words probably, as we do when they ſpeak in the quality of particular Doctors, but we argue thereupon demonſtratively.

I ſubſume. But S. *Auſtin* the ſufficienteſt perſon which the Church of his time had, ſpeaking of a point, wherein he could not be ignorant; ſays not that I believe the Euchariſt to be neceſſary to ſalvation; but the Churches of Chriſt believe ſo, and have received this doctrin from Apoſtolical Tradition: Therefore I argue upon his words not probably, but demonſtratively, that this was the Catholick doctrin of the Church of his time. And thus much for

for the *Theſis, That the Euchariſt was held generally neceſſary for all.* Now for the *Hypotheſis; That the Euchariſt was held neceſſary for Infants in particular.* Witneſſes hereof are S. *Cyprian,* Pope *Innocentius* I. and *Euſebius Emiſſenus,* with S. *Auſtin* together with the Author of the Book intituled *Hypognoſtica.*

*Cyprian* indeed does not in terms affirm it, but we have a very clear intimation of it in his Epiſtle to *Fidus.* For whereas he and a Council of Biſhops together with him, had ordered, that Infants might be *baptized* and *ſacrificed,* that is, *communicated* before the eighth day, though that were the day appointed for Circumciſion by the old Law. There he ſets down this as the reaſon of their Decree, *that the mercy and grace of God, was to be denied to no man.*

Pope *Innocent* the firſt, (in *Ep. ad Epiſ. Conc. Milev. quæ eſt inter Auguſt.* 93.) concludes againſt the *Pelagians*; that Infants could not attain eternal life without Baptiſm; becauſe without Baptiſm they were uncapable of the Euchariſt, and without the Euchariſt could not have eternal life. His words are, *but that which your Fraternity affirms them to Preach, that Infants without the grace of Baptiſm may have the rewards of eternal life, is certainly moſt fooliſh; for unleſs they eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his blood; they ſhall have no life in them.*

Now that this ſenſe which I have given his words, is indeed the true ſenſe of them, and that his judgment upon the point was as I have ſaid; it is acknowledged by *Maldonate* in *Joan.* 6. *v.* 54. by *Binius* upon the Councils *Tom.* 1. p. 624. by *Sanctesius, Repet.* 6. c. 7. and it is affirmed by S. *Auſtin* who was his Contemporary, held correſpondence by Letters with him, and therefore in all probability could not be ignorant of his meaning. I ſay he affirms it, as a matter out of Queſtion, Epiſt. 106. and *Cont. Julian.* lib. 1. c. 4. where he tells that *Pelagius* in denying this, did diſpute *contra ſedis Apoſtolicæ authoritatem*; againſt the authority of the Sea Apoſtolick; and after, *but if they yield to the Sea Apoſtolick, or rather to the Maſter himſelf and Lord of the Apoſtles, who ſays, that they ſhall not have life in them, unleſs they*

*eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, which none may do but those that are baptized; then at length they will confess, that Infants not baptized cannot have life.*

Now I suppose no man will doubt, but the belief of the Apostolick Sea; was then (as S. *Austin* assures us *l.* 1. *cont. Jul. c.* 4.) the belief of the Church of *Rome*, taking it for a particular Church: and then it will presently follow, that either other Churches do not think themselves bound in conformity of belief with the *Roman* Church, notwithstanding *Irenæus* his——*necesse est ad hanc Ecclesiam, omnem convenire Ecclesiam:* or that this was then the Doctrin of the Catholick Church. For *Eusebius Emissenus* I cannot quote any particular proof out of him: but his belief in this point is acknowledged by *Sancte s.* Repet. 6. c. 7. Likewise for S. *Austin*, the same *Sanctesius* and *Binius*, and *Maldonate*, either not mindful or not regardful of the Anathema of the Council of *Trent*, acknowledge (in the places above quoted) that he was also of the same belief: and indeed he professeth it so plainly and so frequently, that he must be a meer stranger to him that knows it not, and very impudent that denies it. *Eucharistiam infantibus putet necessariam Augustinus*, say also the Divines of *Lovaine*, in their *Index* to their Edition of S. *Austin:* and they refer us in their *Index* only to Tom. 2. pag. 185. that is, to the 106. Epist. (the words whereof I have already quoted to shew the meaning of *Innocentius*) and to Tom. 7. pag. 282. that is, lib. 1. *de pec. Mer. & remis.* c. 20. where his words are; *Let then all doubt be taken away: Let us hear our Lord I say, saying not of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, but of the Sacrament of his Table (to which none may lawfully come, but he which has been baptized) unless you eat the flesh of the Son and drink his blood, you shall have no life in you; what seek we any further? what can be answered hereunto? What, will any man dare to say, that this appertains not to little Children, and that without the participation of his body and blood, they may have Life?* &c. with much more to the same effect. Which places are indeed so plain and pregnant for that purpose, that I believe they thought it needless to add more: otherwise had they pleased they might

might have furniſhed their Index with many more referrences to this point; as *de Pec. Mer. & Rem.* l. 1. c. 24. where of Baptiſm and the Euchariſt he tells us, that *Salus & vita eterna ſine his fruſtra promittitur parvulis.* The ſame he has *Cont.* 2. *Epiſt. Pelag. ad Bonifacium* l. 1. c. 22. which yet by *Gratian de Conſec. D.* 3. *c. Nulli.* and by *Tho. Aquinas p.* 3. *q.* 3. *art.* 9. *ad tertiam* is ſtrangely corrupted and made to ſay the contrary, and *l.* 4. *c.* 4. the ſame *Cont. Julian. l.* 1. *c.* 4. and *l.* 3. *c.* 11. & 12. *Cont. Pelag. & Celeſt.* l. 2. c. 8. *de Prædeſt. Sanctorum ad Proſp. & Hilar. l.* 1. *cap.* 14. Neither doth he retract or contradict this opinion any where, nor mitigate any one of his ſentences touching this matter, in his Book of *Retractations. Sanctesius* indeed tells us, that he ſeems to have departed from his Opinion, in his works againſt the *Donatiſts.* But I would he had ſhewed ſome probable reaſon to make it ſeem ſo to others; which ſeeing he does not, we have reaſon to take time to believe him. For as touching the place mentioned by *Beda* in 1. *ad Corinth.* 10. as taken out of a Sermon of S. *Auſtins, ad infantes ad Altare.* Beſides that it is very ſtrange S. *Auſtin* ſhould make a Sermon to Infants; and that there is no ſuch Sermon extant in his works; nor any memory of any ſuch in *Poſſidius*, S. *Auſtins* Scholars Catalogue of his works, nor in his Book of *Retractaitons*: ſetting aſide all this, I ſay Firſt, That it is no way certain that he ſpeaks there of Infants, ſeeing in propriety of ſpeech (as S. *Auſtin* himſelf teacheth us *Ep.* 23.) Infants were not *Fideles*, of whom S. *Auſtin* in that ſuppoſed Sermon ſpeaks. Secondly, Admit he does ſpeak of Infants, where he aſſures us, that in Baptiſm every faithful man is made partaker of Chriſts body and blood, and that he ſhall not be alienated from the benefit of the Bread and Cup, although he depart this life, before he eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup. All this concludes no more, but that the actual participation of the Euchariſt, is not a means ſimply neceſſary to attain ſalvation, ſo that no impoſſibility ſhall excuſe the failing of it: Whereas all that I aim at is but this, that in the judgment of the Ancient Church, it was believed neceſſary, in caſe of poſſibility; neceſſary, not

*in*

*in actu*, but *in voto Ecclesiæ*: not necessary to salvation simply, but necessary for the increase of grace and glory: And therefore, Lastly, though not necessary by *necessity of means*, for Infants to receive it; yet necessary by *necessity of precepts* for the Church to give it.

The last witness I promised, was the Author of the work against the *Pelagians* called *Hypognostica*, who (*l.* 5. *c.* 5.) ask the *Pelagians*, *Seeing he himself hath said, unless you eat the flesh*, &c. *How dare you promise eternal life to little Children, not regenerate of water and the Holy Ghost; not having eaten his flesh, nor drank his blood.* And a little after, *Behold then, he that is not Baptized, and he that is destitute of the Bread and Cup of life, is separated from the Kingdom of Heaven.*

To the same purpose he speaks *l.* 6. *c.* 6. But it is superfluous to recite his words, for either this is enough or nothing.

The third kind of proof, whereby I undertook to shew the belief of the ancient Church in this point, was the *Confession of the learnedest Writers and best verst in the Church of* Rome. Who, what the Council of *Trent* forbids under Anathema, that any man should say of any ancient Father, are not yet afraid, nor make no scruple, to say it in plain terms of the whole Church for many Ages together, *viz.* That she believed the Eucharist necessary for Infants. So doth *Maldonate* in *Joan.* 6. *Mitto Augustini & Innocentii sententiam (quæ etiam viguit in Ecclesia per sexcentos annos) Eucharistiam etiam Infantibus necessariam.* I *say nothing* says he, of *Austins* and *Innocentius* his opinion, *that the Eucharist was necessary even for Infants, which doctrin flourished in the* Church for 600. years.

The same almost in terms hath *Binius*, in his Notes on the Councils, pag. 624. *Hinc constat Innocentii sententia (quæ sexcentos circiter annos viguit in Ecclesiâ, quam Augustinus sectatus est) Eucharistiam etiam infantibus necessariam fuisse.*

Lastly, That treasury of Antiquity Cardinal *Perron*, though he speaks not so home as the rest do, yet he says enough for my purpose: *des passages de S. August.* c. 10. p. 101.

p. 101. *The Cuſtom of giving the Euchariſt to Infants the Church then obſerved as profitable.* This I ſay is enough for my purpoſe. For what more contradictious, than the Euchariſt being the ſame without alteration to Infants being the ſame without alteration, ſhould then be profitable and now unprofitable: then all things conſidered expedient to be uſed, if not neceſſary, and therefore commanded: And now, though there be no variety in the caſe, all things conſidered not neceſſary, nor expedient, and therefore forbidden.

The Iſſue of all this Diſcourſe, for ought I can ſee, muſt be this: That either both parts of a Contradiction muſt be true, and conſequently nothing can be falſe, ſeeing that which contradicteth truth is not ſo: or elſe, that the Ancient Church did err in believing ſomething expedient which was not ſo; (and if ſo, why may not the preſent Church err, in thinking *Latin*-Service, and Communion in one kind expedient:) or that the preſent Church doth err, in thinking ſomething not expedient, which is ſo. And if ſo, why may ſhe not err, in thinking Communicating the Laity in both kinds, and Service in vulgar Languages, not expedient.

---

V. *An.*

## V. *An Argument drawn from the Doctrin of the Millenaries, againſt Infallibility.*

THE Doctrin of the *Millenaries* was, *That before the worlds end, Chriſt ſhould reign upon earth for a thouſand years, and that the Saints ſhould live under him in all holineſs and happineſs.* That this Doctrin is by the preſent *Roman* Church held falſe and Heretical, I think no man will deny.

That the ſame Doctrin, was by the Church of the next Age after the Apoſtles held true and Catholick I prove by theſe two Reaſons.

The firſt Reaſon, Whatſoever doctrin is believed and taught by the moſt eminent Fathers of any Age of the Church, and by none of their contemporaries oppoſed or condemned, that is to be eſteemed the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of thoſe times.

But the Doctrin of the *Millenaries* was believed and taught by the eminent Fathers of the Age next after the Apoſtles, and by none of that Age oppoſed or condemned.

Therefore it was the Catholick Doctrin of the Church of thoſe times. The Propoſition of this Syllogiſm is Cardinal *Perrons* rule, (in his Epiſtle to *Caſaubon*, 5. obſerv.) And is indeed one of the main pillars, upon which the great Fabrick of his Anſwer to King *James* doth ſtand, and with which it cannot but fall; and therefore I will ſpend no time in the proof of it.

But the Aſſumption thus I prove.

That Doctrin which was believed and taught by *Papias* Biſhop of *Hierapolis*, the diſciple of the Apoſtles diſciples (according to *Euſebius*) who lived in the times of the Apoſtles, ſaith he, by *Juſtin Martyr*, Doctor of the Church and Martyr: by *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis*, who had the gift of Propheſie, witneſs *Tert.* and whom *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth a Saint. By S. *Irenæus* Biſhop of *Lyons* and Martyr; and was not oppoſed and condemned by any one Doctor

Doctor of the Church of thoſe times: That Doctrine was believed and taught by the moſt Eminent Fathers of that Age, next to the Apoſtles, and oppoſed by none.

But the former part of the Propoſition is true. *Ergo*, the Latter is alſo true.

The Major of this Syllogiſm and the latter part of the Minor, I ſuppoſe will need no proof, with them that conſider, that theſe here mentioned were equal in number to all the other Eccleſiaſtical Writers of that Age, of whom there is any memory remaining; and in weight and worth infinitely beyond them: they were *Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus, Egeſippus* and *Hippolitus*: of whoſe contradiction to this Doctrine there is not extant, neither in their works, nor in ſtory, any Print or Foot-ſtep: which if they or any of them had oppoſed, it had been impoſſible, conſidering the Eccleſiaſtical Story of their time is Written by the profeſſed Enemies of the Millinaries Doctrine; who could they have found any thing in the monuments of Antiquity to have put in the Ballance againſt *Juſtin Martyr* and *Irenæus*, no doubt would not have buried it in ſilence: which yet they do, neither vouching for their opinion any one of more Antiquity than *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, who lived, ſaith *Euſebius, noſtra ætate*, [in our Age] but certainly in the latter part of the third Century. For *Tatianus* becauſe an Heretick I reckon not in this number. And if any man ſay that before his fall he wrote many Books; I ſay, it is true; but withal would have it remembred, that he was *Juſtin Martyrs* Scholar, and therefore, in all probability of his Maſters Faith, rather than againſt it, all that is extant of him one way or other is but this in S. *Hierome, de Script. Eccleſ.* Juſtini Martyris *ſectator fuit.*

Now for the other part of the Minor, that the forementioned Fathers did believe and teach this Doctrine. And firſt for *Papias* that he taught it, it is confeſſed by *Euſebius* the Enemy of this Doctrine (*Lib.* 3. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. c.* 33.) in theſe words, —— *Other things beſides the ſame Author* (Papias) *declares, that they came to him as it were by unwritten Tradition, wherein he affirms that after the Reſur-*

*rection of all Fleſh from the Dead, there ſhall be a Kingdom of Chriſt continued and eſtabliſhed for a thouſand years upon Earth, after a humane and corporeal manner.* The ſame is confeſſed by S. *Hierome*, another Enemy to this opinion, (*deſcript. Eccleſ. S.* 29.) Papias *the Auditor of* John *Biſhop of* Hieropolis *is ſaid to have taught the Judaical Tradition of a thouſand years, whom* Irenæus *and* Apollinarius *followed.* And in his preface upon the Commentaries of *Victorinus* upon the *Apocalypſe*, thus he writes, — *before him* Papias *Biſhop of* Hieropolis *and* Nepos *Biſhop in the parts of* Egypt *taught as* Victorinus *does touching the Kingdom of the thouſand years.*

The ſame is teſtified by *Irenæus* (*lib.* 5. *cont. Her. c.* 33.) where having at large ſet forth this Doctrine, he confirms it by the Authority of *Papias* in theſe words. Papias *alſo the Auditor of* John, *the familiar friend of* Policarpus *an Ancient man, hath teſtified by writing theſe things in the fourth of his Books, for he hath writtten five.* And concerning *Papias* thus much.

That *Juſtin Martyr* was of the ſame belief, it is confeſſed by *Sixtus Senenſis* (*Biblioth. Stæ. l.* 6. *An.* 347.) by *Feverdentius* in his premonition before the five laſt Chapters of the 5th. Book of *Irenæus*. By *Pamelius* in *Antidoto ad Tertul. parad. paradox.* 14.

That S. *Melito* Biſhop of *Sardis* held the ſame Doctrine is confeſſed by *Pamelius* in the ſame place; and thereupon it is that *Gennadius Maſſilienſis* in his Book *de Eccleſ. dogmatibus*, calls the followers of this opinion *Melitani*; as the ſame *Pamelius* teſtifies in his Notes upon that fragment of *Tertullian de Spe fidelium.*

*Irenæus* his Faith in this point is likewiſe confeſſed by *Euſebius*, in the place before quoted in theſe words. *He* (Papias) *was the Author of the like Error to moſt of the Writers of the Church, who alledged the Antiquity of the Man for a defence of their ſide, as to* Irenæus *and whoſoever elſe ſeemed to be of the ſame opinion with him.*

By S. *Hierome* in the place above cited *de ſcript. Eccleſ. S.* 29. Again in *Lib. Ezek.* 11. in theſe words. *For neither do we expect from Heaven a Golden* Hieruſalem (*according to the Jewiſh tales which they call* Duteroſſis) *which alſo*

*ſo many of our own have followed: Eſpecially* Tertullian *in his Book* de ſpe fidelium; *and* Lactantius *in his ſeventh Book of Inſtitutions, and the frequent expoſitions of* Victorinus Pictavionenſis: *and of late* Severus *in his Dialogue which he calls* Gallus: *and to name the* Greeks *and to joyn together the firſt and laſt,* Irenæus *and* Apollinarius. Where we ſee he acknowledges *Irenæus* to be of this opinion; but that he was the firſt that held it, I believe that that is more a Chriſtian untruth than *Irenæus* his opinion a Judaical Fable. For he himſelf acknowledges in the place above cited, that *Irenæus* followed *Papias*; and it is certain and confeſſed that *Juſtin Martyr* believed it long before him: and *Irenæus* himſelf derives it from —— *Preſbyteri qui* Johannem *diſcipulum Domini viderunt*; from Prieſts which ſaw *John* the Diſciple of the Lord. Laſtly, by *Pamelius, Sixtus Senenſis,* and *Faverdentius* in the places above quoted.

Seeing therefore it is certain, even to the confeſſion of the Adverſaries, that *Papias, Juſtin Martyr, Meleto* and *Irenæus,* the moſt conſiderable and eminent men of their Age, did believe and teach this Doctrine; and ſeeing it has been proved as evidently as a thing of this nature can be, that none of their contemporaries oppoſed or condemned it; It remains according to Cardinal *Perrons* firſt rule; that this is to be eſteemed the Doctrine of the Church of that Age.

My ſecond Reaſon I form thus. Whatſoever Doctrine is taught by the Fathers of any Age, not as Doctors but as witneſſes of the Tradition of the Church, (that is, not as their own opinion, but as the Doctrine of the Church of their times) that is undoubtedly to be ſo eſteemed; eſpecially if none contradicted them in it. But the Fathers above cited teach this Doctrine, not as their own private opinion, but as the Chriſtian Tradition, and as the Doctrine of the Church, neither did any contradict them in it. *Ergo,* it is undoubtedly to be ſo eſteemed.

The Major of this Syllogiſm, is Cardinal *Perrons* ſecond Rule and way of finding out the Doctrine of the Ancient Church in any Age: and if it be not a ſure Rule, farewel the uſe of all Antiquity.

And for the *Minor*, there will be little doubt of it, to him that conſiders, that *Papias* profeſſes himſelf to have received this Doctrine by unwritten Tradition, though not from the Apoſtles themſelves immediately, yet from their Scholars, as appears by *Euſebius* in the forecited third Book 33. Chapter.

That *Irenæus* grounding it upon evident Scripture, profeſſes that he learnt it, (whether mediately or immediately I cannot tell) from (*a*) *Presbyteri qui* Johannem *Diſcipulum Domini viderunt.* Prieſts or Elders who ſaw *John* the Lords Diſciple, and heard of him what our Lord taught of thoſe times (of the thouſand years) and alſo, as he ſays after, from *Papias* the Auditor of *John* the Chamberfellow of *Polycarpus*, an Ancient man who recorded it in writing.

(*a*) *Faverdentius* his Note upon this place is very Notable. *Hinc apparet* (ſaith he) from hence it appears that *Irenæus* neither firſt invented this opinion, nor held it as proper to himſelf, but got this blot and blemiſh from certain Fathers. *Papias* I ſuppoſe and ſome other inglorious fellows, the familiar Friends of *Irenæus*, are here intended.

I hope then if the Fathers which lived with the Apoſtles had their blots and blemiſhes; it is no ſuch horrid Crime for *Calvin* and the *Century writers* to impute the ſame to their great Grandchildren. *Ætas parentum pejor avis progeniem fert vitioſiorem.* But yet theſe inglorious Diſciples of the Apoſtles, though perhaps not ſo learned as *Faverdentius*, were yet certainly ſo honeſt, as not to invent lies and deliver them as Apoſtolick Tradition; or if they were not, what confidence can we place in any other unwritten Tradition.

Laſtly, that *Juſtin Martyr* grounds it upon plain Prophecies of the *Old Teſtament*, and expreſs words of the *New*: he profeſſeth, *That he, and all other Chriſtians of a right belief in all things, believe it*; joyns them who believe it not, with them who deny the Reſurrection; or elſe ſays, that none denied this, but the ſame who denied the Reſurrection; and that indeed they were called Chriſtians, but in deed and Truth were none.

Whoſo-

Whoſoever, I ſay, conſiders theſe things will eaſily grant, that they held it not as their own opinion, but as the Doctrine of the Church and the Faith of Chriſtians.

Hereupon I conclude, whatſoever they held, not as their private opinion, but as the Faith of the Church, that was the Faith of the Church of their time: But this Doctrine they held, not as *their* private opinion, but as the Faith of the Church. *Ergo*, it was and is to be eſteemed the Faith of the Church.

*Trypho.* "Do ye confeſs that before ye expect the "coming of Chriſt, this place *Hieruſalem* ſhall be again "reſtored, and that your People ſhall be congregated, and "rejoyce together with Chriſt, and the Patriarchs and "the Prophets, *&c.*

*Juſtin Martyr.* "I have confeſſed to you before, that "both I and many others do believe, as you well know, "that this ſhall be; but that many again, who are (not) "of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians, do not "acknowledge this, I have alſo ſignified unto you: "For I have declared unto you, that ſome called Chriſtians, "but being indeed *Atheiſts* and impious *Hereticks*, do gene-"rally teach blaſphemous and Atheiſtical and fooliſh things: "but that you might know that I ſpeak not this to you on-"ly, I will make a Book as near as I can of theſe our diſ-"putations, where I will profeſs in writing that which I "ſay before you; for I reſolve to follow not men, and the "Doctrines of men, but God and the Doctrine of God. "For although you chance to meet with ſome that are "called Chriſtians, which do not confeſs this, but dare "to Blaſpheme the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Iſaac*, and "the God of *Jacob*, which alſo ſay there is no Reſurrecti-"on of the Dead, but that as ſoon as they die their Souls "are received into Heaven, do not ye yet think them "Chriſtians: as neither if a man conſider rightly will he "account the Sadducees and other Sectaries and Hereticks, "as the *Geniſtæ* and the *Meriſtæ* and *Galileans*, and *Phariſees* "and *Hellenians* and *Baptiſts* and other ſuch to be *Jews*; but "only that they are called *Jews*, and the Children of *Abra-*"*ham*, and ſuch as with their lips confeſs God (as God

"himſelf

"himſelf cries out) but have their Hearts far from him. "But I and all Chriſtians that in all things believe aright, "both know that there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the "Fleſh, and a thouſand years in *Hieruſalem* reſtored and "adorned and inlarged; according as the Prophets, *Ezekiel* "and *Eſay* and others do teſtifie: for thus ſaith *Iſaiah* of "the time of this thouſand years. *For there ſhall be a new* "*Heaven and a new Earth, and they ſhall not remember the former*, &c. And after. —— "A certain man amongſt us "whoſe name was *John*, one of the Twelve Apoſtles of "Chriſt, in that *Revelation* which was exhibited unto him, "hath foretold-- That they which believe our Chriſt "ſhall live in *Hieruſalem* a thouſand years, and that after, "the Univerſal and everlaſting Reſurrection and Judgment "ſhall be.

I have preſumed in the beginning of *Juſtin Martyrs* anſwer to ſubſtitute (not) inſtead of (alſo) becauſe I am confident, that either by chance, or the fraud of ſome ill-willers to the Millinaries opinion; the place has been corrupted, and (ו) turned into (לֹא) (not) into (alſo.) For if we retain the uſual reading—— *But that many who are alſo of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians do not acknowledge this, I have alſo ſignified unto you*; then muſt we conclude, that *Juſtin Martyr* himſelf did believe the opinion of them which denied the thouſand years, to be the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians: and if ſo, why did he not himſelf believe it? nay how could he but believe it to be true, profeſſing it (as he does if the place be right) to be the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians: for how a falſe Doctrine can be the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians, what Chriſtian can conceive? or if it may be ſo, how can the contrary avoid the being untrue, unholy and not the opinion of Chriſtians?

Again, if we read the place thus —— *That many who are alſo of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians, do not acknowledge this, I have alſo ſignified*: certainly there will be neither ſenſe nor reaſon, neither coherence nor conſequence in the words following—— *For I have told you of many called Chriſtians, but being indeed Atheiſts and Hereticks,*

*reticks, that they altogether teach blaſphemous and impious and fooliſh things*: for how is this a confirmation or reaſon of, or any way pertinent unto what went before? if there he ſpeak of none but ſuch as were, *puræ piæque Chriſtianorum ſententiæ*, of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians. And therefore to diſguiſe this inconſequence, the Tranſlator has thought fit to make uſe of a falſe Tranſlation, and inſtead of——*for I have told you*, to make it, —— *beſides I have told you of many*, &c. Again, if *Juſtin Martyr* had thought this *the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians*, or them good and holy Chriſtians that held it; why does he rank them with them that denyed the Reſurrection? Why does he ſay afterward —*Although you chance to meet with ſome that are called Chriſtians which do not confeſs this, do not ye think them Chriſtians.* Laſtly, what ſenſe is there in ſaying as he does——*I and all Chriſtians that are of a right belief in all things, believe the Doctrine of the thouſand years*, and that the Scriptures both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* teach it, and yet ſay ——*That many of the pure and holy opinion of Chriſtians do not believe it?* Upon theſe reaſons I ſuppoſe it is evident, that the place has been corrupted, and it is to be corrected according as I have corrected it, by ſubſtituting οὐ in the place of καὶ (not) inſtead of (alſo.) Neither need any man think ſtrange that this misfortune of the change of a Syllable ſhould befal this place, who conſiders that in this place *Juſtin Martyr* tells us that he had ſaid the ſame things before, whereas nothing to this purpoſe appears now in him. And that in *Victorinus* comment on the *Revelation*, wherein, (by S. *Hieroms* acknowledgment) this Doctrine was ſtrongly maintained, there now appears nothing at all for it, but rather againſt it. And now from the place thus reſtored, theſe Obſervations offer themſelves unto us.

1. That *Juſtin Martyr* ſpeaks not as a Doctor, but as a witneſs of the Doctrine of the Church of his time. I (ſaith he) and all Chriſtians that are of a right belief in all things hold this: And therefore from hence according to Cardinal *Perrons* Rule, we are to conclude, not probably but demonſtratively, that this was the Doctrine of the Church of that time.

2. That

2. That they held it as a neceſſary matter, ſo far as to hold them no Chriſtians that held the Contrary: *though you chance to meet with ſome called Chriſtians that do not confeſs this, but dare to Blaſpheme the God of* Abraham, Iſaac *and* Jacob, *&c. Yet do not ye think them Chriſtians*: Now if *Bellarmines* Rule be true, that Councils then determine any thing as matters of Faith, when they pronounce them Hereticks that hold the Contrary; then ſure *Juſtin Martyr* held this Doctrine as a matter of Faith, ſeeing he pronounceth them no Chriſtians, that contradict it.

3. That the Doctrine is grounded upon the Scripture of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* and the *Revelation* of S. *John*, and that by a Doctor and Martyr, of the Church, and ſuch a one as was converted to Chriſtianity within 30 years after the Death of S. *John*, when in all probability there were many alive, that had heard him expound his own words and teach this Doctrine: and if probabilities will not be admitted, this is certain out of the moſt authentical records of the Church, that *Papias* the Diſciple of the Apoſtles Diſciples taught it the Church, profeſſing that he had received it from them that learned it from the Apoſtles: and if after all this, the Church of thoſe Times might Err in a Doctrine ſo clearly derived and authentically delivered, how without extream impudence can any Church in after times, pretend to Infallibility.

The *Millinaries* Doctrine was over-born, by imputing to them that which they held not: by abrogating the Authority of S. *John*'s Revelation, as ſome did: or by derogating from it, as others; aſcribing it not to S. *John* the Apoſtle, but to ſome other *John*, they know not who: which —— *Dionyſius* the firſt known adverſary of this doctrine and his followers; againſt the Tradition of *Irenæus*, *Juſtin Martyr*, and all the Fathers their Anteceſſors: by calling it a Judaical opinion and yet allowing it as probable by corrupting the Authors for it, as *Juſtin*, *Victorinus*, *Severus*.

## VI. *A Letter relating to the ſame Subject.*

*SIR,*

I Pray remember, that if a conſent of Fathers either conſtitute or declare a Truth to be neceſſary, or ſhew the opinion of the Church of their Time; then that opinion of the Jeſuits, concerning Predeſtination upon preſcience (which had no oppoſer before S. *Auſtin*) muſt be ſo, and the contrary Heretical of the Dominicans; and the preſent Church differs from the Ancient, in not eſteeming of it as they did.

Secondly, I pray remember, that if the Fathers be infallible, (when they ſpeak as witneſſes of Tradition) to ſhew the opinion of the Church of their Time, then the opinion of the *Chiliaſts* (which now is a Hereſie in the Church of *Rome*) was once Tradition in the Opinion of the Church.

Thirdly, Since S. *Auſtin* had an opinion, that of whatſoever no beginning was known, that came from the Apoſtles, many Fathers might ſay things to be Tradition upon that ground only; but of this Opinion of the *Chiliaſts*, one of the ancienteſt Fathers *Irenæus* ſays not onely that it was Tradition, but ſets down Chriſts own words when he taught it, and the pedigree of the opinion from Chriſt * to *John* his Diſciple; from him to ſeveral Prieſts (whereof *Papias* was one who put it in writing) and ſo downwards; which can be ſhewn from no other Father, for no other opinion, either controverted, or uncontroverted. *Faverdent. Edit.* Iren. *p.* 497.

Fourthly, That if *Papias* either by his own error, or a deſire to deceive, could cozen the Fathers of the pureſt age in this, why not alſo in other things? why not in twenty as well as one, why not twenty others as well as he.

Fifthly, That if the Fathers could be cozened, how could general Councils ſcape? who you ſay make Tradition one of their Rules, which can only be known from the Fathers?

Sixthly, If they object, how could errors come in, and no beginning of them known? I pray remember to ask them the same Question concerning the *Millenaries*, which lasted uncontradicted, until *Dionysius Alexandrinus* two hundred and fifty years after Christ; and if they tell you that *Papias* was the first beginner, look in *Irenæus*, and he will tell you the contrary. (*Loco citato* l. 5. c. 33.)

Seventhly, Remember, that if I ought not to condemn the Church of *Rome* out of Scripture, because my interpretation may deceive me; then they ought not to build their Infallibility upon it (and less upon her own word) because theirs may deceive them: unless the same thing may be a wall when you lean upon it, and a bulrush when we do.

Eighthly, Remember that they cannot say, they trust not their Interpretation in this, but a consent of Fathers; because the Fathers are not said to be infallible, but as they tell the Opinion of the Church of their time, which is infallible: therefore they must first prove out of Scripture that she is infallible, or else she (who is her self the subject of the Question) cannot be allowed till then to give a verdict for her self.

Ninthly, Remember the *Roman* Church claims no Notes of the Church, but what agree with the *Grecian* too (as Antiquity, Succession, Miracles, &c.) but onely Communion with the Pope and Splendor; both which made for the *Arians* in *Liberius* his time; and it were a hard Case, that because the *Greeks* are poor upon Earth, they should be shut out of Heaven.

Tenthly, Remember that if we have an Infallible way, we have no use (at least no necessity) of an Infallible Guide; for if we may be saved by following the Scripture as near as we can (though we err) it is as good as any Interpreter to keep unity in charity (which is only needful) though not in opinion: and this cannot be ridiculous, because they say, if any man misinterpret the Council of *Trent*, it shall not damn him; and why (without more ado) may not the same be said of Scripture?

VII. *An*

## VII. *An Argument againſt the Infallibility of the preſent Church of* Rome, *taken from the Contradictions in your Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation.*

*Chillingworth.* THat Church is not infallible, which teacheth Contradictions: But the Church of *Rome* teacheth Contradictions. Therefore the Church of *Rome* is not infallible.

Mr. *Daniel.* I deny the Minor.

*Chilling.* That Church teacheth Contradictions, which teacheth ſuch a Doctrin as contains Contradictions: But the Church of *Rome* teacheth ſuch a Doctrin: Therefore the Church of *Rome* teacheth Contradictions.

Mr. *Daniel.* I deny the Minor.

*Chilling.* The Doctrin of Tranſubſtantion contains Contradictions: But the Church of *Rome* teacheth the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation: Therefore the Church of *Rome* teacheth ſuch a Doctrin as contains Contradictions.

Mr. *Dan.* I deny the Major.

*Chilling.* That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould have the true figure of a mans body, and ſhould not have the true figure of a mans body, is a Contradiction: But in the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation it is taught, that the ſame thing, (*viz.* our Saviour preſent in the Sacrament) has the true figure of a mans body, and has not the true figure of a mans body at the ſame time; therefore the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation contains Contradictions.

Mr. *Dan.* The Major, though not having all rules required to a contradiction (as boys in Logick know) yet let it paſs.

*Chilling.* Boys in Logick know no more conditions required to a Contradiction, but that the ſame thing ſhould be affirmed and denied of the ſame thing at the ſame time. For my meaning was, that that ſhould not be accounted the ſame thing, which was conſidered after divers manners.

Mr. *Dan.* I deny the Minor of your ſyllogiſm.

*Chilling.* I prove it, according to the ſeveral parts of it: And firſt, for the firſt part. He muſt have the Figure of a mans body in the Euchariſt, who is there without any real alteration or difference from the natural body of a man: But our Saviour, according to the *Romiſh* Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, is in the Sacrament without any real alteration or difference from the natural body of a man: Therefore according to this Doctrin he muſt there have the figure of a mans body. To the ſecond part, that he muſt not have the figure of a mans body in the Sacrament, according to this Doctrin, thus I prove it. He muſt not have the figure of a mans body in the Euchariſt, which muſt not have extenſion there: But our Saviours body, according to the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, muſt not have extenſion there; Therefore, according to this doctrin, he muſt not have the figure of a mans body there. The Major of this Syllogiſm I proved, becauſe the figure of a mans body could not be without extenſion. The Minor I proved thus; That muſt not have extenſion in the Euchariſt, whoſe every part is together in one and the ſame point: But according to this Doctrin, every part of our Saviours body muſt be here in one and the ſame point: therefore here it muſt not have extenſion.

Mr. *Dan.* Anſwered, by diſtinguiſhing the Major of the firſt Syllogiſm, and ſaid; that he muſt not have the true figure of a mans body, according to the reaſon of a figure taken in its eſſential conſideration, which is to have *poſitionem partium ſic & ſic extra partes*; but not the accidental conſideration, which is in *ordine ad locum.* And this anſwer he applied for the ſolution of the Minor, ſaying thus, Our Saviour is there without any real alteration intrinſecal, but not extrinſecal; for he is not changed in order to himſelf, but in order to place: Or otherwiſe, he is not altered in his continual exiſtence, which is only *modus eſſentiæ* and inſeparable even by divine power, though altered *in modo exiſtendi*, which is ſituation and required to figure taken in order to place.

*Chilling.*

*Chill.* Againſt this it was replied by *Chillingworth*: That the diſtinction of a mans body as conſidered in it ſelf, and as conſidered in reference to place, is vain, and no ſolution of the Argument: And thus he proved it; If it be impoſſible, that any thing ſhould have ſeveral parts one out of another in order, and reference of each to other, without having theſe parts in ſeveral places; then the diſtinction is vain: But it is impoſſible, that any thing ſhould have ſeveral parts one out of another, without having theſe parts in ſeveral places; Therefore the diſtinction is vain.

The Major of this Syllogiſm he took for granted.

The Minor he proved thus: Whatſoever body is in the proper place of another body, muſt of neceſſity be in that very body, by poſſeſſing the demenſions of it: therefore, whatſoever hath ſeveral parts one out of the other, muſtof neceſſity have them one out of the place of the other; and conſequently in ſeveral places.

For illuſtration of this Argument he ſaid; If my head and belly and thighs and legs be all in the very ſame place; of neceſſity my head muſt be in my belly, and my belly in my thighs, and my thighs in my legs, and all of them in my feet, and my feet in all of them; and therefore if my head be out of my belly, it muſt be out of the place where my belly is; and if it be not out of the place where my belly is, it is not out of my belly but in it.

Again, to ſhew that according to the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation, our Saviours body in the Euchariſt hath not the ſeveral parts of it out of one another, he diſputed thus: Whereſoever there is a body having ſeveral parts one out of the other, there muſt be ſome middle parts ſevering the extreme parts: But here, according to this Doctrin, the extreme parts are not ſevered, but altogether in the ſame point; Therefore here our Saviours Body cannot have parts one out of other.

Mr. *Dan.* To all this (for want of a better Anſwer) gave only this. *Let all Scholars peruſe theſe.* After, upon better conſideration, he wrote by the ſide of the laſt Syllogiſm this: *Quoad entitatem verum eſt, non quoad locum,* that is, according to entity it is true, but not according to place.

place. And to (*Let all Scholars peruſe theſe*) he cauſed this to be added; *And weigh whether there is any new matter*, worth a new Anſwer.

*Chillingworth* Replyed, That to ſay the extreme parts of a body are ſevered by the middle parts according to their entity, but not according to place, is ridiculous. His reaſons are firſt, Becauſe ſevering of things is nothing elſe, but putting or keeping them in ſeveral places, as every ſilly woman knows; and therefore to ſay, they are ſevered but not according to place, is as if you ſhould ſay, They are heated, but not according to heat; they are cooled, but not according to cold: Indeed is it to ſay, they are ſevered, but not ſevered.

---

## VIII. *An account of what moved the Author to turn a Papiſt, with his own Confutation of the Arguments that perſwaded him thereto.*

I Reconciled my ſelf to the Church of *Rome*, becauſe I thought my ſelf to have ſufficient reaſon to believe, that there was and muſt be always in the World ſome Church, that could not err: and conſequently ſeeing all other Churches diſclaimed this priviledge of not being ſubject to error; the Church of *Rome* muſt be that Church which cannot err.

I was put into doubt of this way which I had choſen, by D. *Stapleton* and others; who limit the Churches freedom from Error to things neceſſary only, and ſuch as without which the Church can be a Church no longer, but granted it ſubject to error in things that were not neceſſary: Hereupon conſidering that moſt of the differences between *Proteſtants* and *Roman* Catholicks; were not touching things neceſſary, but only profitable or lawful; I concluded, that I had not ſufficient ground to believe the *Roman* Church either could not or did not err in any thing, and therefore no ground to be a *Roman* Catholick.

Againſt

Againſt this again I was perſwaded, that it was not ſufficient to believe the Church to be an *infallible believer* of all doctrins neceſſary; but it muſt alſo be granted an *infallible teacher* of what is neceſſary; that is, that we muſt believe not only that the Church teacheth all things neceſſary, but that all is neceſſary to be believed, which the Church teacheth to be ſo: in effect, that the Church is our Guide in the way to Heaven.

Now to believe that the Church was an infallible Guide, and to be believed in all things which ſhe requires us to believe, I was induced: Firſt, becauſe there was nothing that could reaſonably conteſt with the Church about this Office, but the Scripture: and that the Scripture was this Guide, I was willing to believe, but that I ſaw not how it could be made good, without depending upon the Churches authority.

1. That Scripture is the Word of God.

2. That the Scripture is a perfect rule of our duty.

3. That the Scripture is ſo plain in thoſe things that concern our duty, that whoſoever deſires and endeavors to find the will of God, there ſhall either find it, or at leaſt not dangerouſly miſtake it.

Secondly, I was drawn to this belief, becauſe I conceived that it was evident, out of the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, that there muſt be unto the worlds end a Succeſſion of Paſtors, by adhering to whom, men might be kept from wavering in matters of faith, and from being carried up and down with every wind of falſe doctrin.

That no Succeſſion of Paſtors could guard their adherents from danger of error, if themſelves were ſubject unto error, either in teaching that to be neceſſary which is not ſo, or denying that to be neceſſary which is ſo: and therefore,

That there was and muſt be ſome Succeſſion of Paſtors, which was an infallible guide in the way to Heaven; and which ſhould not poſſibly teach any thing to be neceſſary which was not ſo; nor any thing not neceſſary which was ſo: upon this ground I concluded, that ſeeing there muſt be ſuch a Succeſſion of Paſtors, as was an infallible guide;

and

and there was no other (but that of the Church of *Rome*) even by the confeſſion of all other Societies of Paſtors in the world; that therefore that Succeſſion of Paſtors is that infallible Guide of Faith which all men muſt follow.

Upon theſe grounds I thought it neceſſary for my ſalvation, to believe the *Roman* Church, in all that ſhe thought to be, and propoſed as neceſſary.

Againſt theſe Arguments it hath been demonſtrated unto me; and Firſt againſt the firſt. That the reaſon why we are to believe the Scripture to be the word of God, neither is nor can be the Authority of the preſent Church of *Rome*, which cannot make good her Authority any other way, but by pretence of Scripture: and therefore ſtands not unto Scripture (no not in reſpect of us) in the relation of a Foundation to a building, but of a building to a Foundation, doth not ſupport Scripture, but is ſupported by it. But the general conſent of Chriſtians of all Nations and Ages, a far greater company than that of the Church of *Rome*, and delivering univerſally the Scripture for the word of God, is the ordinary external reaſon why we believe it: whereunto the Teſtimonies of the Jews, enemies of Chriſt, add no ſmall moment for the Authority of ſome part of it.

That whatſoever ſtood upon the ſame ground of Univerſal Tradition with Scripture, might juſtly challenge belief, as well as Scripture: but that no Doctrin not written in Scripture, could juſtly pretend to as full Tradition as the Scripture, and therefore we had no reaſon to believe it with that degree of faith, wherewith we believe the Scripture.

That it is unreaſonable to think, that he that reads the Scripture, and uſes all means appointed for this purpoſe, with an earneſt deſire and with no other end, but to find the will of God and obey it, if he miſtake the meaning of ſome doubtful places, and fall unwillingly into ſome errors, unto which no vice or paſſion betrays him, and is willing to hear reaſon from any man that will undertake to ſhew him his error: I ſay, that it is unreaſonable to think, that a God of goodneſs will impute ſuch an error to ſuch a man.

Againſt

Againſt the ſecond it was demonſtrated unto me, that the place I built on ſo confidently, was no Argument at all for the Infallibility of the Succeſſion of Paſtors in the *Roman* Church, but a very ſtrong Argument againſt it.

Firſt, no Argument for it; becauſe it is not certain, nor can ever be proved, that S. *Paul* ſpeaks there of any ſucceſſion; *Epheſ.* 4. 11, 12, 13. For let that be granted which is deſired, that in the 13. ver. by [*until we all meet*] is meant, until all the Children of God meet in the Unity of Faith; that is, unto the Worlds end: yet it is not ſaid there, *that he gave Apoſtles and Prophets*, &c. *which ſhould continue*, &c. *until we all meet*, by connecting the 13. *ver.* to the 11. But he gave (then upon his Aſcenſion and miraculouſly endowed) Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* for the work of the miniſtry, for the Conſummation of the Saints, for the Edification of the Body of Chriſt, until we all meet, that is, if you will, unto the Worlds end. Neither is there any incongruity, but that the Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* which lived then, may in good ſenſe be ſaid, now at this time and ever hereafter to do thoſe things which they are ſaid to do: For who can deny but S. *Paul* the Apoſtle and Doctor of the Gentiles, and S. *John* the Evangeliſt and Prophet, do at this very time (by their writings, though not by their perſons) do the work of the miniſtry, conſummate the Saints, and Edifie the Body of Chriſt.

Secondly, it cannot be ſhewn or proved from hence, that there is or was to be any ſuch ſucceſſion: becauſe S. *Paul* here tells us only, that he gave ſuch in the time paſt, not that he promiſed ſuch in the time to come.

Thirdly, it is evident, that God promiſed no ſuch ſucceſſion, becauſe it is not certain that he hath made good any ſuch promiſe; for who is ſo impudent as to pretend, that there are now, and have been in all Ages ſince Chriſt, ſome Apoſtles and ſome Prophets and ſome Evangeliſts and ſome Paſtors and Teachers: Eſpecially ſuch as he here ſpeaks of, that is, endowed with ſuch gifts as Chriſt gave upon his Aſcenſion; of which he ſpeaks in the 8 *ver.* ſaying; *He led Captivity Captive, and gave gifts*

*unto men.* And that thoſe gifts were —— Men endowed with extraordinary Power and Supernatural gifts —— it is apparent, becauſe theſe Words, *and he gave ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets,* &c. are added by way of explication and illuſtration of that which was ſaid before —— *and he gave gifts unto Men*: And if any man except hereunto, that though the Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts were extraordinary and for the Plantation of the Goſpel, yet Paſtors were ordinary and for continuance: I anſwer, it is true, ſome Paſtors are ordinary and for continuance, but not ſuch as are here ſpoken of: not ſuch as are endowed with the ſtrange and heavenly gifts, which Chriſt gave not only to the Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts, but to the inferior Paſtors and Doctors of his Church, at the firſt Plantation of it: And therefore S. *Paul* in the 1ſt. to the *Corinth.* 12. 28. (to which place we are referred by the Margent of the Vulgar Tranſlation, for the explication of this,) places this gift of teaching amongſt, and prefers it before many other miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghoſt: Paſtors there are ſtill in the Church, but not ſuch as *Titus* and *Timothy* and *Apollos* and *Barnabas*: not ſuch as can juſtly pretend to immediate inſpiration and illumination of the Holy Ghoſt: And therefore ſeeing there neither are nor have been for many Ages in the Church, ſuch Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* as here are ſpoken of, it is certain he promiſed none; or otherwiſe we muſt blaſphemouſly charge him with breach of his promiſe.

Secondly, I anſwer, that if by *dedit he gave,* be meant *promiſit,* he *promiſed* for ever; then all were promiſed and all ſhould have continued. If by *dedit* be not meant *promiſit,* then he promiſed none ſuch, nor may we expect any ſuch by vertue of, or warrant from this Text that is here alledged: And thus much for the firſt Aſſumpt which was, that the place was no Argument for an infallible ſucceſſion in the Church of *Rome.*

Now for the ſecond, That it is a ſtrong Argument againſt it, thus I make it good.

The Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts and Paſtors, which our Saviour gave upon his Aſcenſion, were given by

by him that they might Conſummate the Saints, do the work of the Miniſtry, Edifie the Body of Chriſt, until we all come into the Unity of Faith, that we be not like Children wavering and carried up and down with every wind of Doctrine. The Apoſtles and Prophets, *&c.* that then were, do not now in their own perſons and by oral inſtruction do the work of the Miniſtry, to the intent we may be kept from wavering and being carried up and down with every wind of Doctrine: therefore they do this ſome other way: Now there is no other way by which they can do it, but by their writings; and therefore by their writings they do it: therefore by their writings and believing of them we are to be kept from wavering in matters of Faith: therefore the Scriptures of the Apoſtles and Prophets and Evangeliſts are our Guides. Therefore not the Church of *Rome.*

---

*FINIS.*

---